



WAR
OR
A UNITED WORLD

BY
SOTERIOS NICHOLSON

Author of
"A WORLD-CITY OF CIVILIZATION," Etc.



Published by
THE WASHINGTON PUBLISHING HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1916

Copyright 1916

BY

SOTERIOS NICHOLSON

4450

MAR 27 1916

(C) Cl. 12827+

760 | .

To

JAMES BROWN SCOTT, A. M., J. U. D., LL. D.

A staunch advocate of peace, a prudent counsellor and a loyal friend, this book is respectfully dedicated.

WAR
OR
A UNITED WORLD

With a Review of its Precursors in Europe
A Retrospect and Estimate

BY
SOTERIOS NICHOLSON

CHAPTERS

	PAGE
I. THE GRECIAN PENINSULA - -	17
II. THE ITALIAN PENINSULA - -	48
III. THE ROMAN EMPIRE - - - -	103
IV. FRANCO-IBERIAN PENINSULA -	119
V. THE BRITISH ISLES - - - -	147
VI. THE RISE OF RUSSIA - - - -	172
VII. GERMANY AND PRUSSIA - - -	201
VIII. CAUSES OF THIS WAR - - - -	225
IX. PEACE WITH JUSTICE - - - -	250

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

THE GRECIAN PENINSULA.

Ancient Greece to Byzantine Empire.

Definition of "Greece"; Minoan and Mycenaean Ages; Age of Tyrants; Siege of Troy; Dr. Schliemann's Excavations; Dorian Invasion; Spartan Descendants of Dorians; First and Second Messenian Wars; Spartan Leaders in Peloponnesus; The Defense of Argos; Periander of Corinth; Dionysius of Syracuse; Pisistratus, a Lover of Art and Culture; Replacement of Tyrants by Democracy; Lycurgus and Solon, Fathers of Law; War of Thebes; Persian Wars; Overthrowing of Croesus by Cyrus; Battle of Marathon; Leonidas in Battle at Thermopylae; Battle at Salamis; Pericles in Power; Third Messenian War; Peloponnesian Wars; Alcibiades; Defeat of Athenians in Sicily by Spartans; Blockade of Athens by Lysander; Artaxerxes; Xenophon; Agesilas, King of Sparta; Corinthian War; Peace of Antalcidas; Overthrow of Sparta; Pelopidas; Epaminondas, Leader of Thebes; Macedonia of Hellenic Stock; Philip, the Conqueror; Sacred War; Philip's Assassination in Greece; Alexander The Great in Asia Minor; Defeat of Darius by Alexander; Alexander in Egypt; Founding the City of Alexandria; Alexander in Persia; Alexander's March into Babylon; Alexander's Arrival in India; Death of Alexander at 32 (323 B. C.); Succession of Antipater Craterus; Achaean League; Romans Entrance into Greece; Battle of Pharsala; Caesar's Reign in Greece; Byzantine Empire (323 A. D. to 1453); Recognition of Christianity by Constantine; Huns in Europe; Visigoths; Invasion of the Empire by Goths; Extinction of Western Roman Empire; Justinian; Belisarius; Destruction of Jerusalem; Leo III; Moslem Invasion; Greek Domination Over the Slavs; Alexius Comnenus; Crusaders; Turks in Macedonia; Mohammed's Siege of Constantinople (1453); Constantine XI Last Byzantine Emperor.

CHAPTER II.

THE ITALIAN PENINSULA.

Rome's Influence; Comparisons; Early Origins; Founding of Rome; Rape of the Sabines; Tales of Warfare; Horatius; Pharsalia; Clan Struggles; Servius Tullius; Coriolanus; Cincinnatus; Reduction of Veii; Mt. Gaurus; Battle of Mt. Vesuvius; Second Samnite War; The Caudine Forks; Third Samnite War; Sentinum; Beneventum; Ariminum; Army Organization; Military Roads; First Punic War; War with Illyrian Pirates; Clastidium; Capture of Saguntum; Trasimenus; Cannae; Zama; Conquests in the East; Magentia; Destruction of Carthage; Destruction of Numantia; The Slav Rebellion; Jugurthine War; Aurasia; The Raudine Fields; Capture of Bovianum; Marius and Sulla; Sulla's Proscriptions; Revolt of Lepidus; War of Sertorius; War of the Gladiators; Pompey and the Pirates; Second Mithridatic War; Tigranes; Death of Mithridates; Pompey's Eastern Conquests; Cataline; Conquest of Gaul; Caesar; Death of Crassus; Murder of Pompey; Caesar's Egyptian Campaign; Asiatic Campaign; African Campaign; Munda; Caesar as a Ruler.

CHAPTER III.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

The Second Triumvirate; Mutina; Death of Cicero; The Four Suicides; Augustus; Defeat of Varus; Arminius; His Apotheosis; Tiberius; Caligula; Claudius; Nero; Arrogance of the Army; Bedriacum; The Siege of Jerusalem; Vespasian and Titus; Agricola in Britain; Christian Persecutions; Trojan; Hadrian's Opposition to War; A "Reign Without Events"; Wars with the Barbarians; The Empire at Auction; A Military Despotism; A Wall Across Britain; Caracalla; Heligabalus; Severus a Contrast; Rivalry Between Maximin and Vitellius; Rapid Fatality in Emperors; The "Thirty Tyrants"; Claudius II; Aurelian; Diocletian's "Tetrarchy"; Constantine; Fate of the Five Contemporaries; Julian "The Apostate"; Protective Policy of Theodosius; Stilicho; Alaric; Aetius and Boniface; Odoacer.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FRANCO-IBERIAN PENINSULA.

Rome Under the Barbarians; The Iberians; Alaric and Athaulf; First Sovereigns of Spain; Clovis and the Soldier; Union of the Franks; Theoderic; Clotaire; Fredegunde and Brunhilde; Origin of

St. Cloud; The Frankish Empire Under Dagobert; Pippin; Charles Martel; Cambrai; Soissons; Tours; Boniface's Labors; Pippin's Donation; Charlemagne; Capture of Verona and Pavia; Conquest of All Italy; Conquest of the Saxons; Wars in Spain; Death of Rowland; The Empire and Feudalism; The First Free Public Schools; Fontanetum; The Norse Invasion; Hastings at Paris; The Split of the Empire Into Seven Kingdoms; Hugh Capet; Invasion of France by Louis III of Germany; Royal Poverty; Tragic Events from 1010 to 1453; The "Universal Spider" French Wars of the Fifteenth Century; French Religious Wars; French Revolution; Treaty of Pillnitz to Restore the Bourbons; Menin; Valmy; Jammappes; The Summer Massacres; The French Republic; The "Reign of Terror"; Assassination and Executions; Dunkirk; Hondschoote; Napoleon Bonaparte; His Rise; Battles of 1797; Marengo; Hohenlinden; Rupture of the Amiens Compact; Austerlitz; Jena; Peace of Tilsit; Junot's Defeat in Spain; Wagram; Waterloo; Later French Wars; The Gothic Kingdom; Founding of Aragon; Founding of Portugal; Cordova; Second City of Europe; Battle of Las Navas; Wars of Charles I; Philip II, Spain's Loss of American Possessions; Ferdinand III, The Reactionary; Isabella II; War Between Carlists and Christians; War with Morocco; King Amadeus; The Republic; Castelar; Alfonso XII; The War of 1898; Alfonso XIII; Lusitania; War the Regular Order; "The Founder"; Henry The Navigator; Portugal's Annexation to Spain; Treaty of Lisbon and The Re-establishment of the Kingdom; Yusuf The Centenarian; Aly's Holy War; Effect of Wellington's Successes; Dom Pedro; The Quadruple Alliance; Brazil's Influence; The Rebellion of 1910; Recognition of Portugal as a Republic.

CHAPTER V.

THE BRITISH ISLES.

The Scandinavians; Gormo; Lobrock; Early Traits; Caesar's Invasions; Caractacus; Druidism; Boadicea; Constantine in York; Danish Invasions; Alfred; Edgar; Sweyn; Hastings; Questions of Territory; William's Revenge; Rochester Castle; Henry's "Charter of Liberties"; Tinchebrai; "Battle of the Standard"; The Plantagenets; John and Richard; Lincoln; Eversham; Edward I; The "Mad Parliament"; Simon de Montfort; Effect of the Crusades; The "Model Parliament"; Wallace; Bannockburn; The Hundred Years War; Crecy; Siege of Calais; Poitiers; Wat Tyler; Shrewsbury; Harfleur; Agincourt; Siege of Orleans; Burning of Joan of Arc; Jack Cade; "Wars of the Roses"; St. Albans; Wakefield; Bosworth Field; League

of Cambrai; The Holy League; Battle of the Spurs; Flodden; "Field of the Cloth of Gold"; Capture of Calais; Kingdom of Waldemar II; The Union of Calmar; Gustavus Vasa King; Freedom of Elizabeth's Reign from War; The "Armada"; The Irish Rebellion; "The Thirty Years' War"; James I; The "Gunpowder Plot"; Edgehill; Naseby; War with the Dutch; Monmouth's Rebellion; Charles II; Sedgemoor; 1688; Battle of the Boyne; Brutal Customs; "War of the Spanish Succession"; Marlborough; Blenheim; Capture of Gibraltar; Ramilles; Almanza; Ondenarde; Malplaquet; Defeat of Eugene; Sheriffmuir; Fontenoy; "The Seven Years' War"; The War of Jenkin's Ear; The Austrian Succession; The Invasion of England; Battle of the Nile; Trafalgar; Waterloo; The Opium War; The Soudan; The Boer War.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RISE OF RUSSIA.

Early Wars; Lipetsk; Kalka; Riazan; Kolomna; Ivan III; Reduction of Kazan; Ivan The Terrible; Demitri the Pretender; Capture of Azof; Revolt in Moscow; Defeat of Razine; Siege of Convent of Solovetski; Peter The Great; Execution of 1,000 Streltsi; Defeat at Narva; Founding of Petrograd; Swedish Repulse at Borysthenes; Pultowa; Losses of Lewenhaupt; War of Polish Succession; First Russian Troops in Germany; Alliance of 1726; Results of Lacy's Campaign, 1736; Reign of Elizabeth; Conquest of Finland; Elizabeth and Frederick The Great; Defeat of Frederick; Entrance of Berlin by the Russians; Death of Peter by Strangling; Catherine II; A Savage War; Massacre of Ouman; Partition of Poland; Defeat of Khan of Tartars; End of Turkish Rule in Peninsula; New Swedish Constitution; Plague at Moscow; Race War; Beheading of Pougatchef; Corrupt Peculation; Catherine's Ukase; Turkish War; Austrian Defeat at Teinesvar; Storming of Ismail; Defeat of Grand Vizier at Matchin; Second Partition of Poland; Bloody Massacre at Braga; Increase of Russia's Domain; Eccentric Paul I; Souvorof's Formulae; Entrance of Milan by Souvorof; Trebbia; Defeat at Zurich; Retreat of Souvorof; Mystery of Paul's Death; French and Russian Treaty; Austerlitz; Eylau; Alexander and Napoleon; Rupture Between Them; Invasion of Russia; Napoleon's Mistake; Borodino; Reception at Moscow; Viasma; Horrors of the Retreat; Settlements; The "Holy Alliance"; Declaration of Independence by Greece; Efforts of the Balkan States; Metternich's Influence; The Grand Vizier's Amusements; Nicholas I; Persian War; Polish Insurrection; Russian Intervention and Seating of Francis Joseph; Crimean War; Losses.

CHAPTER VII.

GERMANY AND PRUSSIA.

The "Battle of Winfield"; Idea of the German Empire; War and Religion; The Pastime of the Gods; The Goths; Conrad I; Lenzenin; Merseburg; Lechfield; Otto I and the Popes; Henry IV's Fate; The Empire and the Church; The Imperial Ghibellines and Papal Guelphs; Legnano; Bouvines; Beneventum; The Empire at Auction; The Sicilian Vespers; The Cities and The Empire; The Hanseatic League; Its Despots and Representatives; Kinds of Crusades; Christian Poland and Its Pagan Neighbors; Teutonic Knights and Holy Wars; The Hapsburgs; Election of Rudolf as Emperor; Ottocar's Oath; Murchfield; Worms; The Archer of Uri; The Pope at Aveignon; Fate of Henry VII; Muhldorf; The Pope's Bull; The Diet of Reuse; Origin of "Ich Dieu"; Rienzi; Tetrarch's Disappointment; Events of Charles IV's Reign; The "Black Death"; The Minorites; The Flagellants; Character of Wenceslaus; Brescia; Sempach; Hussite Wars; Deposal of Three Rival Popes; Rise of Italian Cities; Turkish Invasion; Adrianople; The Janissaries; Bojazet; Trimour; Angora; Capture of Constantinople; Maximilian I; Capture of Milan; Duke Ludovico; Career of Charles V; Wars with France; Muhlberg; The Valladolid Commission; Lepanto; The Catholic League; The "Thirty Years' War"; Prague; Weisloch; Luther; Lutsen; Rheinfeld; Arras; Nordlingen; Sens; Laningen; Terrible Losses; Execution of Hungarian Nobles; Ministers as Galley Slaves; Repulsion of Turks at Vienna; The "Shambles of Eperies"; Burning of Baden and Other Cities; Steinkirk; "Spanish Succession" War; States in Conflict; The Hohenzollerns; Definition of Hohenzollerns; "The Sandbox of the Holy Roman Empire"; The Slav Population of the Roman Empire; "The Great Elector"; Attention to His Army; Frederick III; Frederick William's Frugality; Frederick The Great; Heine's Quatrain; Accession of Territory; Bismarck; Result of Victory Over France.

CHAPTER VIII.

CAUSES OF THIS WAR.

Expansion of a State; Weakening of a State; Analysis of Causes; The Franco-German Rivalry; Alsace-Lorraine; Beginning of Bad Feeling; Dictation of Terms by Bismarck; Increase of French Army; German Militarism; German Policy; Franco-Russian Alliance; *Anglo-German Rivalry*; Colonial Expansion; Prevention of German Expan-

sion by British; Germany's Success in Expansion; Africa; Camerons, New Guinea; Kiao-Chau; Germany and England; Germany and Turkey; Rivalry of Markets; Enlargement of Navies; Slav-Teuton Rivalry; Beginning of Cold German Feeling Toward Russia; Austro-German Alliance; Effect of Balkan Confederation; Dissolution of Balkan League; The Cause; *German Aggressiveness*; German Population; German World-Policy; Militarism of Germany; German Philosophers; *The Oriental Question*; Turkey; Serbia; Bulgaria; Montenegro; Greece; Cause of Greco-Turkish War; Italian-Turkish War; *Balkan Wars*; The Cause; Carnegie Commission; Battle of Sarantaporon; King Constantine in Salonica; Fall of Yanina; Bulgarian Successes; Servian Victories; Siege of Montenegro; Scutari; The London Treaty; Second Balkan War, and the Cause; Defeat of Bulgars by Greeks and Serbians; The Bucharest Treaty; Connection of the Balkan Wars with the European War, and the Cause; Failure of Russian Diplomacy; Triple Alliance; Triple Entente; Effect on Balkans; Denunciation of Treaty by Italy; Immediate Causes of This War; The Assassination of the Austrian Heir; The Ultimatum of Austria; General Concern of the European Powers; Proposals of Sir Edward Grey; Mobilization of the Great Powers; Illumination of the Spark of Warfare.

CHAPTER IX.

PEACE WITH JUSTICE.

The Goblet of War; Claimant of Justice in War; Necessity of War; Nature in Evolution and Suggestions; Theory of War; Man and Nature; Man Against Nature; Competitive Struggle Desirable; Mutual Struggle Unnecessary in Competition; The Fittest to Nature; Goal and Prize; Environment and Nature; Warfare Competition Uncalled For; Warfare Against Co-operation; A Destructive Element; Unfair Test of Worth; Stronger Unnecessarily the Best; War Undesirable; Warfare Unnatural; Co-operation Natural; Human Development; Fellow-Man, a Productive Agent; Conquest of Nature Through Co-operation; Lack of Co-operation Between Nations; National Egotism as Patriotism; Co-operation of States in Production; Carnegie's Federation; *Analysis of Union of States*; Bond of Legal Machinery; Voluntary Adjustment; Freedom of Internal Affairs; Action in Unison; "A United World"; *German System of Government*; The Press; The Unbelievers of State; Attack on Diplomacy; On Governments; On State and Individual; On State and State; Agency Undesirable When Injurious to Humanity; Organization with Freedom in Moderation; Necessity of Proper Enforcement of Organization; Spiritual and

Material Solidarity; War, Exception Rather Than the Rule; Difference of Issue of Individual and State; State and Individual; Difference in Interest Only; Necessity of Co-operation by State and Individual; Individuals as Citizens; Moral Consideration Obligatory on State; State as a Reality; Freedom of State from Cause; Encouragement of Individual Liberty by States; State in Favor of Its Member and Other States; States as Units of Federation; State a Nationality; Federation Powerless Over Internal State Affairs; Union Against Domination; Organization in Equal Rights for All Nations; Difference of Cosmopolitanisms; Nationalism Proper; Unity; Variety; Loyalty; Solidarity; Conclusion of Cosmopolitanism; Nationality; Prevention of War by Federation; The Machinery of Federation; A Legislative Assembly; A Judicial Tribunal; An Executive Body; An International Character; Creation of International Code; A Federal Army and Navy; Elimination of Arms by the State; The Judgment of the Federal Tribunal; Enforcement; Economic Pressure; Armed Force; Time of Action; The Argument of Extreme Pacificists; The Answer; Bryan, Taft and Roosevelt; An Indirect Proceedure; *Peace with Justice*; Mental Process; Positive and Negative Measures; Bryan's Proposal; Committees of Reconciliation; Complete Disarmament; Operation of Each Measure and Its Answer; The Hague Court of Arbitration; Carnegie's "The League of Peace"; Roosevelt's Proposal; Extent of Its Value; Limitations of Decisions by Court; Freedom of National Affairs from Court's Jurisdiction; Honor of a State; President Wilson on the Question of Honor; Nationalities Over Other Nationalities; The Solution; Monroe Doctrine; Its Dangers; A United States of the World; Educational Movement; Public Opinion; Education of Children in International Principles and Sympathy; International Trade and Commerce; Church Work for Peace and Justice; Officialdom and Diplomacy; Conclusion.

INDEX TO PICTURES

	PAGE
ALEXANDER THE GREAT - - - - -	32✓
CAESAR - - - - -	94✓
KING VICTOR EMMANUEL OF ITALY - -	102
PRESIDENT POINCARÉ OF FRANCE - -	118✓
NAPOLEON BONAPARTE - - - - -	132✓
KING GEORGE V OF ENGLAND - - - - -	146✓
CZAR NICHOLAS OF RUSSIA - - - - -	172
FRANZ JOSEPH, EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA -	200
KAISER WILHELM, EMPEROR OF GERMANY	224✓
KING PETER OF SERBIA - - - - -	238✓
KING CONSTANTINE XII OF GREECE - -	240
KING FERDINAND OF ROUMANIA - - -	244
KING ALBERT OF BELGIUM - - - - -	248
ANDREW CARNEGIE, "THE PEACE MAN" -	270
WOODROW WILSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES - - - - -	314

PREFACE.

Confronted with the awful spectacle of the European continent in the convulsions of war, involving that portion of the habitation of man which has made the chief contribution to civilization and progress, no person, however neutral in political coloring, can fail to occupy his mind intensely with the subject of war. In some sense, war seems to have been, from of old, a very important occupation of man; to glance over the history of mankind is to go through pages and pages of accounts of battles, defeats and victories, conclusions of peace and of alliances, and again wars. Now, we would naturally like to understand the meaning of this immensely prevalent phenomenon, to study it in its origins and effects, so as to learn how to combat it. An ill must be studied scientifically, through observation, analysis, and inductive and deductive manipulation, before it can be treated in practical fashion. In the end of such a scientific study of war, this book claims to be a modest contribution, on the one hand, by supplying a history of wars on the European Continent, and thus furnishing a background for observing the phenomenon of war, and on the other hand, by undertaking a general discussion of war, which takes its start on the observations, and connects the phenomenon of war with the topic of the welfare of humanity, and with the course of the natural laws of universal sway. We have conveniently grouped the various

European countries under six headings of war centers, and our historic section takes the form of a résumé of the military developments in each of these centers. As it is impossible to dissociate the military history of a people from its political and general developments—instead of presenting the series of wars as detached fragments to be studied in abstract isolation—we have preferred to traverse the currents of war from within the ocean of the national history of the peoples, and to observe war upon the background of the orderly evolution of the general fortunes of the portion of mankind under consideration.

The résumé will show, we hope, how very often wars have been waged for no valid reason whatever, but have originated from the jealousy of kings and other rulers, from quarrels as to inheritance, and from insignificant misunderstandings; how the waging of warfare on many occasions has been but a game, as it were, in which the nations have participated and in which they sometimes lost and sometimes won, but from which they have invariably suffered, and how enormous has been the total of humanity sacrificed pitilessly on the numerous altars of Mars; how often wars have been internal—in other words, civil wars—resulting in the destruction of the vital energies of the nation or state itself; and finally, we hope, our résumé will give the correct impression that all war is, after all, *civil* war in that it entails the rending by humanity of its own garments of self-preservative armor and the crushing within itself of its own vitality.

But, of course, a house divided against itself cannot stand, and humanity is consequently called upon to make some decision upon the matter both in general and in particular. Thus, in our discussion, we join the topic of war with the topic of the positive good of mankind, and from this view-

point, we raise on the one hand the theoretical questions as to the nature of the best constitution for the sphere of the mutual relationship of men and of groups of men and as to whether the waging of warfare is implied by this constitution, and on the other, the practical question as to the realization of this constitution and—in so far as the plan provides against war—of the discovery of the means which will control, and, if possible, put an end to war.

Such are the considerations which we respectfully offer to our readers with the intention and desire of contributing our own share in the process of the clarification of the issues and of the ultimate settlement of the problems raised by war.

SOTERIOS NICHOLSON.

CHAPTER I.

THE GRECIAN PENINSULA.

Ancient Greece and Byzantine Empire.

It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to give a history of events in Greece arranged in single chronological order, because from the point of view of government, the term "Greece" is not a singular but a collective name. The territory is divided into many parts by natural boundaries, and an accurate historian of Greece must subdivide his account into at least a hundred distinct chronicles of as many Grecian states. In such a sketch as the present claims to be, we need not enter into such detail; all the same, we will be obliged to break the temporal series at a number of points, and to some extent, give the history of the different states separately. Another point worth mentioning is that a history of Ancient Greece must include events which took place not only on the Grecian peninsula, at the foot of the Balkans, but at Sicily, the coast of Asia Minor, the islands, Macedonia and Epirus as well. Indeed, in a very true sense, the Ionians on the coast of Asia Minor have been at times better Greeks than the Athenians.

The oldest elements in ancient Greek life that we know are the Minoan and Mycenaean civilizations. Then comes the Homeric Age, followed by the Dorian Invasion and its widespread influence. Later we have the age of the tyrants (about 650-500 B. C.), which is in turn succeeded by the epoch of the maturity of the Greeks as well as of their decline, embracing the Persian and the Peloponnesian Wars, and ending with the conquest of Philip (480-338). Lastly, we have the age beginning with the career of Alexander and ending with the Roman Conquest (336-146). About the Minoan and Mycenaean civilizations we know very little. No written account of the events has come to us, and all our information is derived from the discovery of antiquities through excavations. The Mycenaean Age probably lasted between 1600 and 1200 B. C., but the Minoan Age must have been of longer stretch, going as far back as 2500 B. C. and reaching until the decline of the Mycenaean Age. As to the epoch that followed the conclusion of these two ages, for a number of centuries, we have no historical material, but a good deal has come down to us in the form of legends and traditions. Thus, we have heard of the Argonautic Expedition led by Jason, who, accompanied by fifty other heroes, sailed on board the *Argo* in search of the golden fleece, in the direction of the Eastern shores of the Black Sea. Then, we have the story of the Seven against Thebes according to which Adrastus, the king of Argos, makes war upon Thebes, aided by five military leaders and by Polynices, the son of *Œdipus*, a former king of Thebes, and defeats him.

Without doubt, the most important of these legends is the story of the Siege of Troy, made famous by the poetic genius of Homer. Troy is represented as a strong state, Greek in character, and occupying territory in Asia Minor, south of the Hellespont. The various leaders and heroes of Greece,

headed by Agamemnon, king of Mycene, besiege Troy in order to avenge the wrong inflicted upon Menelaus, one of their number, by Paris, son of Periam, king of Troy, who seduced and bore away with him the wife of Menelaus, Helen, to his father's city. The siege is reported to have lasted ten years (1894-1884) and to have occupied to an extreme the attention of the Olympian Gods. Achilles was the strongest among the Achaeans, but he withdrew from active service, when Agamemnon took away from him his fair prize—a maiden girl. After an absence of many years, he returned to active participation in the fray. In order to avenge the death of his friend Patroclus, killed by Hector, Achilles slew Hector, but was himself killed later. The city of Troy fell at last through a ruse of Odysseus, the wily, and was given over to plunder and loot. The city was burned, its men were killed and its women were made the slaves of the conquerors.

Though unquestionably this account is traditional, one cannot help thinking that it contains a germ of truth—so widely was it believed by the Greeks themselves. Recent excavations by Dr. Schliemann in the Troad made this view credible owing to the fact that they have disclosed the ruins of a large city, in the old site of Ilion.

The next movement of importance is the Dorian Invasion or the Return of the Heraclidae. Homer represents monarchy to be the form of government during the age whose accounts he gives in his poems, and yet the historic age of Greece (beginning with the eighth century B. C.) dawns with oligarchy established in the various states. To explain the change we must take account of the Dorian Invasion, which is supposed to have taken place toward the end of the twelfth century B. C. According to tradition, the descendants of Heracles, the great hero, who had been previously

exiled from Peloponnesus, returned at last at the head of the Dorians from Thessaly, and succeeded in conquering most of the territory in Peloponnesus. Now, we cannot believe that the conquest was effected by so small a number of people or in such a short interval as tradition chronicles. Undoubtedly the movement was very wide, and may have taken centuries before settling down. At any rate, the Dorian migration must have influenced the character and culture of the people to a very large extent, involving, as it does, the substitution of a rude and hardy civilization for more refined customs and manners.

The Spartans were the most conspicuous descendants of the Dorians. According to legend, the prosperity of Sparta was secured by the adoption of the constitution invented by the great law-giver, Lycurgus. On the whole, the latter is represented to have regarded frugality, simplicity and the military virtues as the foundation stones of a state's life, and upon them did the Spartans base their growth and the fabric of their communal activity. After the state had been reformed through the efforts of Lycurgus, it prospered, became aggressive, and thirsted for conquest. In a short time it brought under subjection all the inhabitants of the Laconian province, such as had not come, as yet, under the influence of the Dorian migration. Then, owing to some border troubles, the Spartans fell upon the Messenians and waged against them what are known as the first and second Messenian Wars (743-723 and 645-631). During the first of these two, the Messenians, led by an able ruler, their king, Aristodemus, offered stout resistance to the Spartans. After continued resistance, the Messenians had to yield and were reduced to vassalage, some of them fleeing to other towns. Again, after some years, the Messenians took up arms and rose in revolt, taking advantage of difficulties and reverses

of the Spartans. Both the Messenians and the Spartans secured allies for themselves, respectively, from among the neighboring states; the former fought valiantly, but finally they were forced to yield; the uprising was crushed and the Messenians were reduced to the condition of the Helots. The class of Helots, it may be explained, contained the slaves of the Spartan people, recruited from the subject population of Sparta.

Thus, Sparta had secured supremacy and her leadership was recognized by practically all the states in Peloponnesus. But Argos held out, and therefore Argos had to be conquered. The town of Tegea surrendered at about 560 B. C., but the city of Argos resisted the encroachments of Sparta for a long time. At last, Cleomenes, the Spartan king, defeated the Argives decisively and set fire to the wood into which they had fled after the battle, thus destroying the larger part of the army.

In the meantime the age of tyrants had begun in Greece. Tyrant was called any ruler who had gained power through unconstitutional means, the term having no reference to his own inherent virtues or capacity. Periander of Corinth was a famous tyrant; under his rule Corinth attained great prosperity. Dionysius of Syracuse is another well-known tyrant. Peisistratus in Athens was a liberal patron of art and culture. However good the tyrants may often have been, they constituted an irregular element in the life of the Greeks, who were a pre-eminently freedom-loving people. Gradually the tyrants were overthrown one by one, and democracy replaced the rule of the tyrants.

Before we proceed further, we may mention that the most characteristic element in the government of the Greeks was the fact that the states were organized on the basis of cities. The city was the unit, each city forming a self-governing,

independent community. Owing to the consequently small size of the population of each state, democracy in government could be carried out to perfection; government did not need to be representative, for each citizen could be present and partake in the deliberations of the Boulé. This extreme individualism of the Greeks was one of the chief causes of their unsurpassed excellence in almost all forms of culture, but in preventing their union into a single nation, it paved the way to their decline, through defeat, by more closely organized and, hence, from a military point of view, stronger races. In fact, there were continual jealousies among the city-states, and the federations which they formed were never of a lasting character.

Let us now turn to Athens. This city appears in the clouds of tradition, in the seventh century B. C., as governed by an oligarchy. In more early times she was under the rule of kings, most famous of whom were Theseus and Codrus. Solo, in Athenian history, plays the role which Lycurgus filled in Spartan history. Solo effected both economic and constitutional reforms in Athens and enacted other special laws, and then left the city. Upon his return he found that his nephew, Peisistratus, was the leader of a revolutionary faction. Peisistratus succeeded in becoming a tyrant and trampling down the liberties of the city. Twice he was expelled and twice he returned, dying at 527 B. C. Of his two sons who succeeded him, the one was assassinated, but the other continued in power for some time until he was at last forced to leave the city. Thus the rule of the tyrants was terminated in Athens (510 B. C.). In the meantime, under the leadership of Cleisthenes, the Athenians became more and more democratic, thus arousing the enmity of the oligarchic party within and the opposition of Sparta from without. The Spartans started an expedition against Ath-

ens, but the movement proved abortive and the invading army dissolved. But the Athenians were indignant and made war against Thebes, which had participated in the movement, and, crossing the channel, captured Chalkis.

We will now turn to the Persian wars which constitute a marked and critical period for the history not only of Greece but of the whole world. By stemming the tide of the Persian and Asiatic invasions in general, Greece saved civilization and culture for the western world and secured its final predominance. The initial event in this movement is the subjugation by Croesus, king of Lydia, an Asiatic power, of the Grecian colonies on the coast of Asia Minor. Croesus, in his turn, was overpowered by Cyrus, ruler of the Persians (546 B. C.), and the Greek cities in Asia were conquered one by one by the generals of the latter. Later, Darius effected the subjugation of the Thracians and of a majority of the Panonians. In 499, the Ionian-Greek inhabitants of the Asiatic coast towns revolted against the Persians, and the Athenians lent them assistance, together with the Eretrians, and sacked the city of Sardis. The insurrection spread, but Darius at once took up arms and crushed the rebellion. The island of Miletus, left in the lurch by its allies, was conquered after a siege of three years (494 B. C.) and was given over to plunder. After subjugating Ionia, Darius decided to take revenge upon the Grecian states which had presumed to aid the Ionians in their sedition; he equipped a fleet and sent it to fight the Greeks, under the command of Mardonius, his son-in-law. But the Thracians defeated the Persian land-forces, while, on the other hand, the fleet was wrecked by a violent storm. But Darius was not dismayed; he equipped another expedition and proceeded to punish the Greeks. Eretria was taken and burned and thereupon the Persian army crossed over to Attica and

landed on Marathon. In the meantime, the Athenians had marched on Marathon, where they had encamped and where they were reinforced by the Plataeans. Miltiades was appointed supreme general and the Athenians, without losing time, gave battle to the Persians. The Greeks ran upon the foe and routed the two wings of his army; then they closed upon his center and completed the defeat of the Persians by putting the whole army to flight (490 B. C.). The battle of Marathon has been regarded throughout history as the most decisive battle of all and it bears witness to the immense valor of the Greeks, who, though greatly outnumbered by the Persians, succeeded in inflicting upon them a severe defeat. The Persians decided thereupon to bear down upon Athens, but finding themselves anticipated by Miltiades, returned to the Ionian shores. At Athens, Themistocles, a very wise statesman, realized that the dangers of renewed Persian invasions had not passed, and he proceeded to develop a very strong navy for the Athenians.

Darius died, while making preparations for another expedition against the Greeks, and was succeeded by his son Xerxes, who resolved to follow in the footsteps of his father. The Hellespont was spanned by a bridge and the isthmus at Mount Athos was cut by a canal. The Greeks got wind of these preparations and assembled together in order to consider the best means of withstanding the invader. Owing to jealousies, not all of them united; nevertheless, they decided to make a stand. The Persians crossed the Hellespont in the spring of 480 B. C., and passed over into Thessaly, from which, in order to cross down to Central Greece, they had to proceed through a narrow pass, called Thermopylae, where Leonidas, with three hundred Spartans, and six thousand other allies, had been stationed to prevent the forcing of the passage. After giving effective resistance to the Per-

sian army, the Greeks had to yield owing to an act of treachery by a native Greek who led the Persians over the mountains and thus caused the Greek army to be caught in the rear. The allies were given time to flee, but Leonidas with his three hundred Spartans, together with seven hundred Thesbians, refused to retreat and died fighting valiantly and upholding his country's honor. Upon being informed of the loss of the pass of Thermopylae, the Greek fleet which had been offering resistance at Artemisium withdrew to the gulf of Salamis and Xerxes followed it there. Battle was given, and the Persian fleet was destroyed. Thereupon Xerxes returned home, leaving Mardonius with three hundred thousand men to continue the war. The next year (479 B. C.) Mardonius crossed into Beotia, where the Greeks, about 110,000 strong, met him at Platea, and, chiefly owing to the valor of the Lacedaemonians, put his army to rout. On the same day, the Persian naval forces, discouraged by their previous reverses, easily yielded to the attacks of the Greek fleet and fled, their ships being later put to fire and burned.

Now, since the victory over the Persians had been due chiefly to the initiative and valor of the Athenians working in the cause of all Hellas, Athens was duly recognized by the rest as the leader of all the Greek states. The city, which had been burned by the Persians when the Athenian fleet had withdrawn to Salamis, was rebuilt and strong walls erected around her. At the same time, Athens recognized that her power lay on the sea and proceeded to strengthen her navy; in 477 B. C. the confederacy of Delos was formed under the supremacy of Athens, embracing the Ionian states, the islands of the Aegean and some of the states in Central Greece. But Athens was too arrogant; she converted the federation into an empire and reduced the confederates to

tributaries. Athens continued to grow until, at the age of Pericles (459-431 B. C.), she reached the zenith of her power. Pericles pursued the naval policies of his predecessors and was instrumental in the building of the Long Walls which united Athens with Piraeus and Phaleron. In the meantime Sparta had been busy re-establishing her supremacy in Peloponnesus. In 465 B. C. the Helots revolted and were joined by the Messenians in their attempt to crush the power of Sparta; the Lacedemonians had a difficult time, indeed, in putting down the revolt, which came to be called the Third Messenian War.

Gradually there sprang up a keen rivalry between Sparta and Athens. Athens augmented her power by forming an alliance with Argos and Megara, subjugating the Aeginetans and reducing all the Boeotian towns, except Thebes. But in 446 B. C. the Boeotians succeeded in freeing themselves from the Athenian yoke, and after suffering other reverses, as well, Athens concluded a thirty years' truce (445 B. C.) with Sparta and her allies, by the provisions of which she agreed to forego all her possessions in Peloponnesus and to allow the inclusion of Megara into the system of alliance with Sparta.

And now we approach the period of the Peloponnesian Wars which resulted in the loss by Athens of her supremacy, and even of her power. Trouble and quarrels having arisen between Corinth and Athens through various causes for which the latter was to blame, the former appealed to Sparta for aid and upon getting a favorable response continued the war with more impetus. Sparta was aided by most of the Peloponnesian states, and by a number of other states, including Thebes, beyond the Isthmus. The Spartans invaded Attica, and the Athenians prudently withdrew into the city, while their fleet ravaged the coast of

Peloponnesus. In the following year, the invasion of Attica was repeated and again the homes of the inhabitants were made the prey of destructive fires. Moreover a plague broke out in Athens to which about one-fourth of her fighting men, as well as Pericles, her greatest statesman, fell victims. In 427 B. C., Plataea fell into the hands of the Lacedemonian general, after being besieged for three years. In 428 B. C., the city of Mitelyne revolted from Athens, but was quickly forced to surrender and as a result about one thousand of her nobles were put to death. In 424, the Athenians invaded Boeotia, but were badly defeated at Delium. Other battles followed within Boeotia, in which both the Spartan and the Athenian commanders were killed; thereupon negotiations were started and the Peace of Nicias ensued arranging for a truce of fifty years. Thus ended the first campaign of the war, lasting from 431 to 421 B. C.

Alcibiades, an ambitious youth, had now gained the ascendancy in Athens and carried on those negotiations with Sparta which continued after the signing of the peace, with regard to various matters. Indeed, the war went on despite the truce, Sparta and Athens merely refraining from invading each other's territory. In 416, the Athenians attacked and sacked the island of Melos, putting all her male inhabitants to death and selling the women and children into slavery. Alcibiades, who was indeed very ambitious, persuaded the Athenians to undertake an expedition against the Dorian city of Syracuse, in Sicily, holding before their minds the prospects of an eventual conquest of Italy and Africa, and such an aggrandizement of their own power as to render the city of Athens supreme all over Greece and strong enough to subdue even Sparta. But the Spartans, anticipating the plans of the Athenians, sent military forces to Syracuse and, meeting the Athenians in battle, virtually

annihilated their army and their fleet. On being defeated, the Athenian forces had decided to retreat and in fact did march into the interior of Sicily. But they were overtaken, surrounded, and compelled to surrender. The complete failure of the Athenian expedition is due largely to the incompetence of its leader, Nicias, who was superstitious enough to delay his retreat until all hope for the salvation of the army had been lost.

The destruction of her military forces in Sicily proved an irretrievable disaster for Athens. The period between 421 and the defeat of the Sicilian attack at 413 marks the waging of the second Peloponnesian war, and we now cross the threshold of the third war, in which Athens, continuing in her downward path, finally lost her position as a great power in the direction of the policies of Greece. Alcibiades had proved a traitor to his own country and made himself the tool of the schemes of the Spartans. When Chios revolted against the authority of Athens, the Spartans, upon his advice, sent an army to aid the rebels. The defection of Chios was imitated by almost all the rest of the Athenian allies in Asia, excepting Samos, but Athens, rising superior to the dangers and difficulties which confronted her, gathered up all her remaining resources to cope with the enemy. The Athenians defeated the Chions (412) and recovered Hytilene and Clazomenae. The Persians had in the meantime come to the assistance of the Lacedemonians, but had later withdrawn from the alliance, thanks to the intrigues of Alcibiades, who had lost the confidence of the Spartans. Alcibiades, who then succeeded in ingratiating himself again upon the Athenians, seized the power and was instrumental in replacing the democratic by an oligarchic government in the city. The army of the Athenians at Samos recalled Alcibiades and gave him the command, and the war went on under his leadership. At Cynossema

and Abydus the Athenian fleet was victorious over the Spartan allies and at Cyzicus, routed the Peloponnesian fleet so thoroughly that the Spartans proposed terms of peace, which, however, were rejected. For a short time, success favored the Athenians, but the Spartans, aided by the Persians who had changed front again, equipped a new fleet and defeated the Athenians off Notium (407 B. C.); the Spartans were themselves defeated, in their turn, by the fleet of the Athenians at Arginusae (406 B. C.). At last, the next year, the Athenian fleet was surprised by Lysander, the Spartan admiral, and, caught unawares, was captured at Aegospotami, without being able to strike a blow. The victory was far-reaching in results, for Athens was rendered thereby virtually powerless to resist Lysander, who cut off the supplies of Athens and thus caused a famine in the city. He also blockaded Piraeus and laid siege to the city; the Athenians suffered from famine so much that they were compelled to surrender, and comply with Lysander's demands to demolish the fortifications of Piraeus and to yield possession of all their ships except twelve. Athens also agreed to become a subject ally of Sparta. Thus ended the third period of the war, having lasted from 413 to 404 B. C., and indeed the whole Peloponnesian war itself, after having lasted for the space of twenty-seven years.

During the generation following the completion of the war, Sparta was supreme in Greece, and instead of the democratic constitutions, oligarchic governments were established over the various states. At about this time (401) the Spartans, in order to show their gratitude to the Persians for their assistance, sent an army of 10,000 to help Cyrus seize the throne from his brother Artaxerxes. But Cyrus was defeated and the Greek generals were all slain. Upon this, the Greeks chose new generals, including Xenophon,

who later became the famous historian of the expedition, and began their march home, and after a most difficult journey reached the Black Sea. The Spartans later undertook incursions into Asia Minor, defeated the Persians under Tisaphernes, and ravaged the conquered territory. But Agesilaus, the king of Sparta who was in command of the expedition, was obliged to return home where troubles were brewing, in order to save his native country from the dangers threatening it from closer quarters.

The Persians who had perceived the growing disaffection of the Greek states at the progress and prosperity of Sparta sent over delegates to Greece to bribe the states there into rising up against Sparta. Athens formed an alliance with Thebes, her ancient enemy, and the combination was further enlarged by the accession of Corinth and Argos to the group. Whereas at first, hostilities had been confined within the borders of Boeotia, *now*, the field of war was transferred to Peloponnesus, and what is known as the Corinthian war ensued. It was when the Spartans had realized their danger from the side of the new alliance that they saw fit to recall Agesilaus. At Corinth (394) the Lacedemonians were successful, but at Cuidus their fleet was defeated. The Theban allies assisted by the Persians continued the war with varying fortunes, with the result that Sparta lost all her maritime empire. The Spartans again acquired a strong fleet, and the Athenians depressed at the lack of supplies of corn from the Black Sea were loth for peace. In fact, all Greece had tired of the war and was ready to listen to proposals for peace. Negotiations were begun, and the infamous Peace of Antalcidas was concluded (387 B. C.) by which Greece agreed to play into the hands of Persia. All the Greek cities in Asia were surrendered to the latter, and the rest of the Greek cities were made independent,

and the alliance among them broken. This was just what Sparta desired, for with the dissolution of the Boeotian league, no formidable barrier remained against her aggressive schemes. By a surprise attack, Sparta seized the citadel of Thebes, dissolved the Olynthian confederacy, which was the union of a number of Macedonian and Greek towns, and destroyed the city of Mantinea. The other Greek states became indignant and a movement began in resistance to Sparta which resulted in the ultimate overthrow of Spartan hegemony over Greece.

At this time Pelopidas, a Theban exile, re-entered his native city, instigated a revolt against the Lacedaemonian garrison, and freed Thebes from the rule of the latter; under the leadership of Epaminondas, a friend of the former, the Boeotian league was revived, and Athens was encouraged to form a new confederacy. The Spartans, who meant to prevent the growth of Theban power, met Epaminondas, the commander of the Thebans, at Leuctra (371) and suffered a complete defeat. Epaminondas proceeded to Laconia and ravaged the province, and then liberated the Messenians, but when in 362 he again led an expedition into Peloponnesus, he met the Spartans at Mantinea, and though victorious, was killed in the battle. With the death of Epaminondas, the power of Thebes came practically to an end.

We must consider now, before we proceed further, the rise of Macedonia, a country whose fortunes began to mingle very intricately with the fortunes of Greece proper. The Macedonians were of Hellenic stock, a fact which was recognized by the other Greeks, and their history becomes important for our purpose at the period of the rule of Philip II (359-336 B. C.). When Philip ascended the throne, he was consumed with the ambition of achieving conquests in Greece, and to realize this ambition, he began to make

encroachments upon Greek territory. First, he seized Amphipolis, the city which was the gateway of Macedonia into Thrace, and thus succeeded in gaining much territory in Thrace. Then Philip seized the city of Olynthus (348 B. C.) and conquered all the cities (members of the Chalcidian confederacy), which were her allies. He succeeded in participating in the affairs of continental Greece by bribing liberally the Greek politicians, especially those of Athens. Philip's aid was requested and given during the so-called Sacred War against the Phocians, who had robbed the temple of Apollo. Philip had difficulties in the start, but finally compelled the Phocians to yield to punishment. A second and a third Sacred War broke out, and Philip was again called to administer punishment. Philip at once used this opportunity as a means of re-entering continental Greece and invading Attica. Athens perceived her imminent danger and, securing Thebes as an ally, sent a force to fight Philip. At Chaeronea (338) Philip defeated the allied army, and through this victory secured for himself ascendancy over all Greece. At Corinth a convention of all the Greek states (except Sparta) was called by him, and plans were made to make a general recruit of forces from all Greece and from Macedonia in order to invade and subjugate Persia. But when the expedition was made ready and the march had just begun, Philip was assassinated and Alexander, his son, succeeded to his authority.

Alexander was quite young when he ascended the kingly throne and was quite young when he died, but his short career was sufficient to stamp him in history as one of the greatest military generals of mankind. At the death of Philip, the Greek cities thought they could regain their independence and started movements to that effect, but Alexander was not to be outwitted; he quickly marched into Greece, suppressed all rebellious action and secured from the



ALEXANDER THE GREAT

Grecian states recognition of his suzerainty. At 334 B. C., he was ready to march at the head of the expedition, equipped by his father, for the conquest of Persia, after having crushed a new revolt in Thebes and having razed the city to the ground. He crossed the Hellespont, marched to the northeast and met the Persian army on the farther bank of the river Granicus. Alexander, not to be daunted, ordered his cavalry to cross the river, and he immediately followed upon their heels. There, his forces, inspired by enthusiasm at the example of his own valor, charged furiously at the enemy, and routed him.

The gateway into Asia Minor was now open, and city after city fell into the hands of the youthful commander. Some states resisted, indeed, but they were quickly subdued. First the west and then the south were overrun; the city of Halicamassus, proving obstinate, was razed to the ground. As winter was approaching, Alexander sent a small part of the army back, and then commenced the task of subduing the provinces of Caria, Lycia, and Pamphulia, a task which he successfully accomplished. On reaching Gordium in Phrygia, he was joined by recruits from Greece, and in the spring of 333 B. C. he resumed his march. He descended into Cilicia, proceeded along the Mediterranean coast, and on the plain of Issus, at the northeast corner of the Mediterranean, he met a Persian army, said to have consisted of 600,000 men, commanded by Darius in person. The position was too small and narrow in extent to allow free deployment for the army of Darius, and Alexander, availing himself of this disadvantage of the enemy, charged and routed the opposing host, which fled precipitantly, accompanied by Darius, its king.

Alexander did not at once continue his march into the empire, but turned southward in order to subdue Phoenicia.

The inhabitants of Sidon welcomed him readily, but Tyros refused him entrance within its walls. Thereupon, Alexander laid siege to the city and after an effort of seven months succeeded in forcing his entrance into the besieged city. Thence, Alexander marched in the direction of Egypt; Palestine and Philistia surrendered, and Gaza, which offered resistance, was taken and its inhabitants sold as slaves. He marched through Egypt and won the respect of the inhabitants by evincing reverence for their religious tenets. At the mouth of the western branch of the river Nile he founded the city of Alexandria, which later gained much prominence in commerce and learning. From the new city, Alexander set out to visit the oracle of Ammon in the heart of the desert of Libya, and the prestige which he thus gained he put to good use in securing from the natives and his followers the devotion normally directed to a divinity. Leaving Egypt, he resumed his invasion of Persia, and at Phoenicia rejected proposals of peace, on the part of Darius. Marching through Syria, he crossed the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, and, after a four days' march, came upon the enemy's cavalry. Darius had encamped with his whole army upon the plain of Arbela near the village of Gaugamela, and, though Alexander had only 40,000 foot and 7,000 cavalry, he charged the immense host of Darius and scattered it (331 B. C.). The battle of Arbela has been rightly regarded as one of the decisive battles in history, inasmuch as it sealed the overthrow of the dominion of Asiatic power. Alexander, flushed with his victory, marched into Babylon and was acclaimed by the population, which met him with open arms; he showed himself very tolerant toward the religious practices of the people and even participated in them, thus in general gaining the esteem and securing the allegiance of the inhabitants of the territories which he aimed to

subdue. From Babylon, Alexander proceeded to Susa and Persepolis and took possession of the vast treasures of the Persian government and king, and thence he set out in pursuit of Darius. The latter, who had taken refuge in flight, was assassinated by Bessus, one of his satraps, and Alexander caught up with Darius only to find him dead.

Alexander was still thirsty for conquest and urged his army toward the east. He subdued the northern and eastern provinces of Persia, namely, Bactria and Sogdeana. While thus engaged in conquests, Alexander founded numerous cities and peopled them with captives, with fugitives from the conquered territory, and with his own warriors. Leaving Bactria (327 B. C.) Alexander crossed the river Indus and began a campaign of invasion into India. He did not have serious difficulty in bringing the various provinces into subjection; Porus, the Indian king, who was the only one to offer serious resistance, was captured, but was given back his kingdom, though as subject to the dominion of Macedonia. From the banks of the river Hydaspes, Alexander proceeded and captured the city of Sangala. By this time, his soldiers had become weary of continued marches through strange lands, and they refused to go forward. Alexander was obliged to yield, in spite of his passionate desire to extend his conquests to the Ganges. So Alexander embarked on board a large fleet and proceeded to sail down the river Indus. After a trip of several months, the mouth of the river was reached; at this point Alexander dispatched his general, Nearchus, to sail along the coast of the Persian gulf in order to discover some opening of the river Euphrates, and thus find out whether there was any sea route connecting the Indus with the Euphrates, and he himself marched to the west through what is known as Beluchistan. On reaching Carmania he was rejoined by Nearchus, who gave

him the joyful news of the successful completion of the voyage and of the existence of a maritime route connecting the West with the East.

Upon his return, Alexander decided to make Babylon the capital of his now immense empire. But his Macedonian veterans were displeased with his plans to incorporate Asiatics into his army, and also with his own affectation of the manners of an Eastern monarch, and broke out in open mutiny. Alexander succeeded in bringing them into better humor and effected a reconciliation, an event which he subsequently celebrated by a magnificent banquet. While occupied with the consideration of grandiose projects for the administration and aggrandizement of his new empire, Alexander was seized with fever and died at Babylon (323 B. C.), when only thirty-two years of age. The principal achievements of his career consisted in the subjugation of Persia to Greek authority, in the ensuring of a communication between the East and the West, and in the spreading of Hellenic culture throughout the then known world.

As there was no one who possessed enough force of character and genius to follow in the steps of Alexander, the empire was broken up and divided among numerous successors. Before proceeding, let us mention that during Alexander's absence from Europe, Sparta had risen in revolt, together with other Peloponnesian states, but had been finally defeated in battle and forced to yield and recognize once more the supremacy of Macedonian rule. At the death of Alexander, Athens determined to secure independence, and, getting other northern states to join her, she equipped an army and commenced military operations against the Macedonian generals in Greece. These operations have made up what is called the Lamian war. Near Crannon, in Thessaly, Antipater, who had succeeded Alexander with respect to the

government of Greece, inflicted a decisive defeat upon the forces of the allies (322 B. C.), and one by one all the allied states were forced to submit and to lay down their arms. The alliance thus being broken, Athens was left alone and at the mercy of the victor, and she had to comply with all the severe terms of the latter.

We need not follow the fortunes of the various parts of Alexander's empire, for we are concerned here with the developments only as they occurred in Grecian territory. The lands in Asia Minor were joined to the kingdom of Syria, and Greece, together with Macedonia, were given over to Antipater and Craterus, both of whom, as we have just seen, were confronted with numerous obstacles from the very start of their reign. The years following the death of Alexander were full of events in Greece and of military operations in conjunction with or against the Macedonian rulers. Greece changed rulers a number of times, but the vicissitudes of the fortunes of the latter have for us no special interest in this connection. In 279 B. C., the Gauls invaded Rome and after marching through Macedonia forced the pass of Thermopylae and attempted to loot the Temple of Apollo at Delphi. According to tradition, the God intervened, and the Gauls, having lost their leader, returned to Thrace.

While under the feet of Macedonian authority, a confederation was formed in Greece, named the Achaean League, including the Peloponnesian cities. Aratus was the most important of the leaders of the league; he increased its strength until he became confronted by the growing power of Sparta. A rivalry sprang up and Sparta was finally conquered. Another confederacy was the Aetolian League, established about 280 B. C. and made up of the tribes of central Greece. When the Romans conquered Macedonia, they seem to have dissolved the league. The Achaean League

survived the death of its rival, with whom, indeed, it had waged a number of wars, and continued under the protection of the Romans until it added a number of other states, including Sparta, to its original constituents. Later, the Achaeans became enemies of the Romans because of the unjust treatment which a thousand of their leading men had received at the hands of the latter, and began to incite their countrymen to war. But with the siege and occupation of Corinth (by Mummius, the Roman general, in 146 B. C.) the power of the league came to an end. Generally speaking, with the event of the fall of Corinth all Greece came under the rule of Rome.

From 323 to 146 B. C. is the interval which elapsed between the death of Alexander and the conquest of Greece by the Romans. Now begins the interval during which Greece continued under the rule of the Romans up to the time of Constantine, the Roman Emperor who inaugurated the Byzantine Empire in the East. When the Achaean League had suffered dissolution, Greece was recognized as a Roman province. The governor of Macedonia was entrusted with the administration of the affairs of Greece, and the Greeks who were aware of the futility of measures of resistance acquiesced in the arrangement. Not many events of military importance occurred during the period, inasmuch as the center of gravity had shifted from Macedonia as well as from Greece to Rome. But Greece played its part in the development of rivalries between various Roman leaders. One point worthy of notice is the siding of the Greek states with Mithridates during the Mithridatic war (88-89 B. C.), in which Rome constituted the other belligerent party. Greece suffered for its intervention very severely. The Roman general, Cornelius Sulla, confiscated a good deal of property in Greece and punished the disloyal communities;

moreover, owing to the protracted campaigns, Greece was left in a devastated condition. The conflict between Julius Caesar and Pompey, which determined the final supremacy of the former over the latter with respect to the destinies of Rome, furnished another episode during which Greece played a part. In effect, the Greeks provided Pompey with a large part of his fleet, and when, in 48 B. C., the decisive battle was fought between the two great opponents upon the field of Pharsala on Greek territory, the natives contributed to both armies through extensive requisitions made upon them. After Pompey's defeat, the whole country fell into the power of Caesar; the latter, however, proved lenient on the whole, except with respect to individual cities. Again, when Caesar was assassinated, and the conspirators attempted to seize the power, Greece took the side of the latter, Brutus particularly, but she was really too weak to render any considerable assistance (42 B. C.). Greece also suffered from a number of wars, in which she did not *directly* participate, by being called upon to defray their expenses, so that the country became financially exhausted, especially during the time of Mark Antony.

During the reign of Augustus, all Greece was converted into the province of Achaea, excepting Thessaly, which, together with Macedonia, made up another province. Later, the danger from foreign invasions was renewed; in 175 A. D. there was one incursion, which, however, proved unsuccessful; in 253, the inhabitants of Thessalonica averted another projected attack through determined resistance, but in 267-268, hordes of Goths invaded the territory and captured Athens; finally Attic soldiers, assisted by a Roman fleet, succeeded in repelling and destroying the invaders.

With the establishment of Byzantium as the capital of the western division of the Roman Empire in 330 A. D., a new

historical era was inaugurated. The mantle of Hellenism fell upon the shoulders of the newly founded institution popularly known as the Byzantine Empire (more correctly termed Later Roman Empire), and we can follow the fortunes of the Hellenic spirit more accurately in tracing the history of the above-mentioned Byzantine Empire. From now on, therefore, the field of our interest is shifted from the territory of Greece, as such, to the country embraced at first under the sway of Constantine I, and later under the rule of the various Byzantine emperors. The period now under observation begins with 323 A. D. and ends in the year 1453, when Constantinople fell into the hands of the Moslem invaders and the empire was dissolved. Whereas before Athens or Sparta occupied the center of attention as exponents of the Greek spirit and culture, now Constantinople assumes prominence and pre-eminence; consequently a word about the latter city will not be amiss.

The city of Byzantium was founded in the seventh century before Christ by Dorian settlers from the state of Megara. The city was so fortunate in its location that it could not fail to play a very important role in the drama of the life of Eastern Europe. Many times the state of Byzantium fell into the hands of the enemy, *c. g.*, into those of Persia and later into those of Alexander, forming in the case of the latter, part of the great Macedonian Empire. Later, after Byzantium had been incorporated into the Roman Empire, there was an occasion when it resisted Roman rule so violently that the emperor had to appear personally to punish the resistance of the town, with the result that the garrison of the latter was cut to pieces and the town itself deprived of all municipal privileges. When in 323 A. D. war broke out between Constantine, the emperor of the West, and Licinius, the latter took refuge in Byzantium and there

made a desperate stand. After a siege of many months, the city surrendered and the cause of Constantine became supreme. Constantine in the meantime decided that it was necessary to establish a new capital in the East and his choice fell upon Byzantium, but the name was changed, in honor of the Emperor, to Constantinople. The event of chief importance during the reign of Constantine was the recognition of Christianity as the official religion.

After the death of Constantine, the three sons of the emperor, Constand, Constantius, and Constantine, divided the whole empire among themselves, but quarreled in the process so that at the end of sixteen years, Constantine was left master of the whole territory. During his reign, Constantine was occupied with fighting, ceaselessly, German tribes in the West and the Persians in the East. In fact the whole life of the Byzantine Empire may be correctly viewed as a ceaseless warfare against Asiatic powers, namely, Persia, the Saracens, and the Turks. The Byzantine Empire arose at the time when the currents of Asia began to gain momentum and to overflow into Europe, and it was the function of the Byzantine Empire to intercept these incursions until the periods when Western culture became secure and crystallized into a state which made it immune from the result of foreign admixture. The reign of Julian—who succeeded Constantine—was marked by similar wars against the Germans and the Persians. When in 372 the Huns burst into Europe, and into the lands which border the Black Sea, the native inhabitants were overcome with fright and fled before the advance of the invaders. The Visigoths, particularly, begged the Roman Emperor to be allowed to cross the Danube, in order to escape the danger from the Huns. They were granted the permission but were later illtreated by the Romans and a war broke out. In the battle of Adrianople, the Roman Empire suffered

complete defeat at the hands of the Goths and the emperor (who was Valens at this period) was left killed on the battlefield. The Goths bore down from Adrianople to Constantinople, but, dismayed by the sight of the strong fortifications of the city, refrained from attack. Theodosius, who succeeded Valens on the throne, made peace with the Goths and agreed to allow them to settle on Thracian territory and to introduce into his armies their chiefs with their companies of warriors. This was indeed a very dangerous experiment, for, by giving the Goths military authority it resulted in putting the empire into the hands of the barbarians. When Theodosius died and the empire fell into the hands of weaker successors, troubles began at once. The Western Roman Empire largely fell into the hands of the Teutons, and even Constantinople was in danger. Nevertheless the Eastern Byzantine Empire was saved, although the Western Empire succumbed to the attacks of the Teutons—a fact which evidences the superior vitality of the former.

Arcadius, a feeble emperor, died in 408 A. D., and was succeeded by Theodosius II. His reign was quiet, disturbed only by a short war with the Persians, and a longer one with Attila, who, at the head of the Huns, ravaged Europe for some time. It was during the reigns of Leo I (456-474), Zeno (474-491) and Anastasius (491-518) that the Roman Empire was finally extinguished in the West, and fortunately the above-mentioned emperors guided the fortunes of the Eastern Empire very wisely during those troublous times. Zeno had considerable trouble with the Ostrogoths, and the latter were conciliated only when offered the chance to conquer and possess Italy.

Anastasius was succeeded by Justinian, who has been termed "the Great." Justinian was fortunate in being as-

sisted by Belissarius, a really great general. The latter, in 533, sailed from Constantinople for the conquest of the Vandal kingdom in Africa—a feat which he achieved in a single and short campaign. Justinian, satisfied with the winning of Africa, determined upon the conquest of Italy. This undertaking was more difficult, but Belissarius readily entered upon it in 535, subdued Sicily and Naples, and in 536 entered Rome. This campaign was ended in 554, by Narses, another able general, who restored the whole of Italy to the Empire. In the meantime, the southern part of Spain was wrested from the power of the Visigoths. But the latter years of Justinian's reign were clouded with many misfortunes. Slavs, Bulgarians and Germans ravaged various provinces, and the empire had to bear the strain of wars with the Persians and with the Goths at the same time. After the death of Justinian, the empire was attacked by enemies on three sides; by the Lombards in Italy, the Slavs and Avars in the Balkans, and the Persians in the East. The former conquered Italy and the second took possession of Pannonia and Dacia. The Slavs occupied a large part of Macedonia and penetrated into the heart of Peloponnesus, where they settled. On the other hand, the struggle of the empire with Persia was uncompromising. During the reign of Phocas, the Persians overran the eastern provinces and the ruin of the empire was almost complete. Antioch and Damascus among the great cities, and Egypt among the provinces, were conquered, and in 614 Jerusalem was destroyed. Heraclius, who succeeded Phocas, proved a much more competent emperor. He reorganized the army, defeated the Persian forces in a series of great battles, and ultimately broke the power of Persia. Thus the empire was restored and the lost provinces were recovered. But during the latter years of the reign of Heraclius, a new danger ap-

peared in the shape of the invasions of the Saracens. Constantinople was besieged twice; once in 673-677, and a second time, at the accession of Leo III, when the city was besieged by land and sea for a year (717-718). Both times the city resisted effectively, and Europe was saved from Moslem aggression.

The reign of Leo III opens a new period, during which the government was reorganized and the empire established on new foundations. Following Leo's reign, for a period of a hundred and twenty-five years, the Byzantine Empire enjoyed its golden age. Later, up to the middle of the tenth century, the situation was full of operations against the Moslems, consisting of expeditions by the one against the territories of the other and captures of fortresses. In 826 the island of Crete was conquered by the Moslems and Sicily by the Saracens of Africa. Basil I, who ascended the throne in 867, pursued an energetic policy with respect to the West, wresting south Italy from the Saracens and depriving the Lombards of their dominion in the Adriatic. Leo VI, however, lost considerable territory to the Saracens, but in 961 Nicephorus Phocas regained Crete and then Cilicia and part of Syria as well. John Zimisce, who followed Phocas, is remembered by his victory in the battle at Silistria over the Russians who had invaded the Balkan peninsula. Basil II, who succeeded him, subjugated the various Balkan provinces, and especially all eastern and western Bulgaria, establishing in this way Greek domination over the Slavs. Thereupon, he turned his attention to the eastern frontier and conquered a number of Armenian provinces. The successors of Basil were unworthy of the throne and lost most of the provinces which he had gained. Some towns in Syria were lost during the reign of the Romans, but later, under Michael the Paphlagonian, the Saracens in Syria were beaten back and a

Bulgarian rebellion was suppressed. But Serbia was lost to the empire, and toward the end of the eleventh century a new foe began to confront the Byzantines, namely, the Seljuk Turks. These had penetrated Bagdad and overrun Armenia, and at the decisive battle of Manzikert (1071) gained a great victory over the forces of Romanus, the Byzantine emperor, and, indeed, captured the emperor himself. After this disaster, Asia Minor was lost, and the emperors who followed proved unable to stem the tide of demoralization and decay.

But the appearance of Alexius Comnenus on the scene changed the situation. The Normans had already seized South Italy and seemed to be on the verge of extending their conquests. In 1081 the Normans laid siege to Durazzo on the eastern shores of the Adriatic and defeated Comnenus, who had hastened to the assistance of the native population. Durazzo fell and the Normans overran Macedonia and descended into Thessaly, but were finally defeated by the Emperor at Larissa and forced back. Comnenus was compelled at the same time to face the danger coming from the side of the Turks; the latter were assaulting Asia Minor, and Comnenus sought aid from western Europe. The European states contributed a large number of men, who began descending toward the East and proclaiming a crusade against the Moslems; by the assistance of these Crusaders, Comnenus succeeded in securing again the city of Nicaea and many of the provinces of Asia Minor. The Crusaders proceeded to Syria and captured Antioch, but as Comnenus had failed to assist them in the siege, they refused to cede the city to him, but on the contrary, established new Frankish principalities in Syria and the Kingdom of Jerusalem as well.

John, the son of Alexius Comnenus, continued to advance

in Asia at the expense of the Turks. He reduced the provinces of Cilicia, Pisidia, and Pontus, and then attacked the Franks in Syria, forcing them to pay him tribute, but achieving no real conquest. Manuel, the son of John, engaged in a whole series of wars which weakened the economic foundations of the Empire. The most important event immediately following is the Latin conquest of Constantinople. During the reign of the two Angeli brothers, the empire deteriorated both externally and internally. Cyprus and Bulgaria were lost after prolonged wars; in 1203, the Crusaders, restless for adventures, were requested by Alexius Angelus, an exiled prince, to rescue his father from the clutches of the emperor, Alexius III. Fascinated by the prospects of Byzantine gold, the Latin Crusaders undertook an expedition, crossed the Dardanelles and laid siege to Constantinople. The emperor did not oppose their advance, because he trusted to the strength of his fortifications. But his expectations were disappointed and the Venetians stormed the walls and captured the city. But young Alexius, who now ascended the throne, did not fulfill his pledges to the Crusaders, and the latter, enraged, made a plot to put an end to the Byzantine Empire. They captured the city for a second time and sacked it; then, they set to partitioning the Empire among themselves. The Byzantine aristocracy at this time rallied at Nicaea and in 1206 elected Theodore Lascaris, from the imperial line, as emperor. His kingdom grew and in 1261 the emperor Michael Paleologus captured the city of Constantinople from the Latins. But Michael never recovered Northern Thrace and Macedonia, both of which had fallen into the power of the Bulgarians, nor Albania; Greece proper, too, remained outside his dominion.

Toward the end of the thirteenth century, trouble began with the Ottoman Turks. The latter, failing at first in their

attempt to storm the walls of either Constantinople or of Adrianople, ravaged Macedonia and Thessaly and conquered Greece. At about the same time, the provinces in Asia Minor were finally lost by the Byzantines, having fallen into the hands of the Seljuk Turks. The Ottomans operated in the borderland of Bithynia and Mysia and captured the city of Brusa (1326), after a siege which lasted ten years. In the meantime, the Servian power was on the ascent, and in 1330 the Servians crushed the Bulgarians. But in 1387 the Servian power in its turn was crushed by the Ottomans, and the latter were now left in practically sole possession of the field. Thrace had been captured a little earlier and a defeat of the Byzantines at Adrianople at 1361 left the emperor powerless and at the mercy of the Ottoman invader. Murad, sultan of the Ottomans, extended his borders to the Balkans in the north, annexed large territory in Asia Minor from the Seljuks and made John Paleologus, the Byzantine Emperor, his vassal. Murad had had the chance of attacking Constantinople, just after his victory at Adrianople, but had not used the chance. But nine years later, Mohammed, the Conqueror, his successor, marched toward Constantinople and laid siege to the city in the spring of 1453, with an army of 150,000. The emperor, Constantine XI, possessed few men under his control; however, two Genoese vessels arrived with 400 cuirassiers, from outside, and moreover the resident foreigners contributed to the best of their ability in the resistance against the enemy. But opposition was unavailing; the walls were stormed, Constantine was killed, and the city was captured (May 30, 1453). The fall of Constantinople was at the same time the last act in the dissolution of the Byzantine Empire. Thereafter, authority passed completely into the hands of the Ottoman Empire.

CHAPTER II.

THE ITALIAN PENINSULA.

Certain resemblances are noticeable between the development of the first and second war centers of Europe. In both peninsulas there were a good many different tribes of various races and forms of speech before they became welded together into larger bodies; so that their early conflicts for supremacy were much alike, as were the political changes finally resulting in the dominance of a single tribe. Their religious ideas were much the same—idealizations of the forces of nature, differing chiefly in the names assumed for the different gods and goddesses. In both, too, political leaders arose with similar ambitions, aims and purposes; and the dominant power in each peninsula passed through similar stages of struggle, supremacy, decay, and dissolution.

In beginning the historical sketch, we will have to refer to mythical tradition to a large extent.

More than four centuries before the brothers Romulus and Remus had been even suckled by the wolf, the brazen statue of which now stands in the city of Rome, one Aeneas, a Trojan hero, is said to have escaped after the capture of Troy, and, guided by the star of his mother Venus, to have landed on the western shore of Italy with a band of Trojans, where he founded the kingdom of Latium and where the

omens assured him a great empire would be developed. After some three centuries had passed, in the fifteenth generation of descendants, one Amulius usurped the throne of his brother Numitor; and to make his line the more secure, the usurper forced his brother's daughter, Rhea Silvia, to become a vestal virgin under a vow of chastity. But Mars, the god of war, indignant at such treachery, seems to have taken an interest in the matter, and Rhea Silvia became the mother of twin boys, Romulus and Remus. Unfortunately the wicked Amulius had the mother slain or thrown into prison and the infants set afloat in a trough on the Tiber. But the Tiber overflowed its banks, and, the cradle catching in the roots of a wild fig-tree near Mount Palatine, a she-wolf overheard the baby's cries, rescued and carried them to her den and nourished them with her own milk.

A shepherd of the king who subsequently discovered the fate of Rhea Silvia found the infants and carried them to his home. When nearly grown, he told them the story of their birth. Whereupon they slew their great uncle Amulius, and restored their grandfather Numitor to the throne. Then they resolved to build a city at the very place where they were so near being drowned. There were seven great hills in that vicinity. Remus selected the Aventine Hill, and Romulus the Palatine. To settle the question, pursuant to the grandfather's advice, they watched for omens, each standing on his hill. Remus saw six vultures flying in the air, but Romulus saw twelve; and so the site of the future city was located on the Palatine hill and Romulus designated as king. According to custom, having yoked a bull and a pure white heifer to a plow, he traced a furrow around the hill by which to locate the boundaries of the city; and soon rude protecting walls were rising. Remus derisively leaped over the wall, whereupon his brother struck him dead,

exclaiming: "So perish all who leap over the walls of my city!"

This is said to have occurred in 735 B. C., *Anno urbis conditae*, from which the Romans fixed their dates as A. U. C.; and, if these accounts are true, it is seen that Rome had its inception in war through tragic family combats; while, if not true, they at least indicate the combative tendencies of the minds in which these tales originated.

Of a similar character was the next step in the genetic development of the city and people. The followers of Romulus were regarded by the neighboring tribes, it appears, as robbers and outlaws, so that no head of a family would permit his daughter to marry among them. The Sabine nation were nearest and accordingly Romulus and his band arranged a plan to secure wives *en masse*. A feast in honor of Neptune was announced, with games and dances; and this was attended very generally by the Sabine families. When at the height of the revelry, the Romans to the number of 683, if we may believe the accounts, each seized a Sabine girl and bore her away to his house. According to the custom, the girl, having received a ring and having passed the sheepskin on the threshold—indicating that her duty would be to spin her husband's wool—became the latter's wife. How Romulus, with Hersilia and the rest of his followers, set up housekeeping, while some two years later Tatius, king of the Sabines, led his army against the Romans to recover the girls; how Tarpeia was slain by the very gifts she coveted—the shields of the Sabines—as the reward for her treason; how Romulus and the Sabines became one nation, and Romulus finally was taken up in a storm of thunder and lightning, by his father Mars, the god of war, to reign with the celestials, where he was worshipped by the Romans under the name of Quirinus, are tales of the

same general order, and, whether fabulous or true, involve the element and idea of war.

So during the terms of all the succeeding generations, from the peaceful reign of Numa Pompilius, 715 B. C., to the expulsion of the Tarquins, 509 B. C., when the consular government began, the central theme seems to be war—and little else than war. Of such nature are the tales of the Horatii and Curatii; of the triple murder that made Tarquinius Superbus, king; of the treachery of his son in subduing the gabii; and of the suicide of Lucretia, which caused the gates to be shut upon Tarquin and resulted in the election of the Consuls.

The most conspicuous events, as recorded under the Republic, were of a warlike character. The attempt of the Tuscan king, Lars Porsena, to restore Tarquin to the throne of Rome, involves a justification of war. Porsena's troops forced the Romans back across the bridge leading to the Janiculum gate upon the Tiber. Leaving three men—Horatius, Lartius, and Herminius—to guard the outer entrance of the bridge, the main body of the Roman army hastened across to destroy it by cutting away the timbers underneath and thus to prevent the passage of the Tuscans.

Sending his comrades across when their weapons had given out, Horatius kept back their army single-handed, crying out, according to the poet:

“For how can man die better
Than by facing fearful odds
For the ashes of his fathers
And the temples of his gods?”

Then, as the bridge fell, amidst showers of weapons, he plunged into the Tiber and swam across, escaping with the loss of an eye and a maimed foot which lamed him for life.

The adventure of Caius Mucius or Scaevola, the left-handed, in the enemies' camp, the battle at Lake Regillus, where Tarquin was assisted by the Latins, but the Romans by Castor and Pollux, and death of Tarquin, if legendary, also partake of the same strenuous character.

Up to the time of the Empire, or the battle of Pharsalia, 45 B. C., there existed almost continual warfare. This was of three general classes: Struggles for social equality or supremacy between the plebeians and patricians; contests for supremacy between the tribes of the peninsula, and foreign wars of conquest, or for the purpose of repelling invaders. The union of the Romans and Sabines was followed by the admixture of a third people, probably the Etruscans or Tuscans, who had settled upon the Caelian hill. These, with the Romans upon the Palatine hill and Sabines upon the Quirinal, united under the kings, and a temple to Jupiter was built on the Capitoline hill, one to Diana on the Aventine hill, while a single fortification was made to encompass the seven hills, including the Esquiline and Viminal. In time those settled here formed an aristocratic class of old Roman families. In their system, a group of early families descended from a common ancestor formed a gens and each gens was governed by a chief (*decurio*), who performed the rites in religion and led in warfare. Each gens belonged to a larger group called a *curia*, while the united *curiae* made up the tribe. Under the kings each of the three tribes had one hundred representative members in the assembly and only members of these tribes could vote or be elected. So it came about at the beginning of the consular government that a great number of persons from other cities who had settled in Rome, because not belonging to the old families possessed no political rights. They were called plebeians and

could not vote, hold office or marry into patrician families, though they were allowed to hold property of their own.

This state of things naturally resulted in the merging of a class struggle between the patricians and plebeians, especially as in the outset one of the rights withheld from a plebeian was permission to serve in the army. This was one of the earliest rights, however, extended to the lower classes.

A considerable part of the history of Rome refers to these struggles. Many of the Romans in those days had small farms in the country, which they worked with the aid of their children and slaves. Often they ran into debt for lands or to improve what they possessed. Plebeians thus had frequently to borrow money from patricians. The Roman law was severe on the debtor. Not only could his lands be seized in default of payment, but he himself could be thrown into prison or sold into slavery. His wife and children could be sold also, and if creditors demanded it, the man himself could be cut into pieces and the fragments apportioned out according to the debts.

Under Servius Tullius (567 B. C.), plebeians were admitted to a restricted suffrage, but at the beginning of the republic the common people, on account of the almost constant wars waged, found themselves overwhelmed with debt, their homes and fields sold, and themselves often maltreated by pitiless creditors. Driven to desperation, they openly resisted, and one of these debtors, a brave centurion, escaping from prison, ran into the Forum in chains with his rags hanging about him and demanded of the astonished judges and people if it was just that one who had committed no crime should be subjected to such treatment? On this the plebeians withdrew from the city in a body to the Sacred Mount. The Senate was alarmed and sent ten deputies with a consul, Menenius Agrippa, who persuaded them to return

by relating the allegory of the stomach and the revolt of the other organs of the body.

In 494 B. C., a solemn compact was entered into to the effect that the debts of all insolvent persons should be canceled, and those imprisoned for debt released. Also, in order to protect the plebeians from oppression, two officers—tribunes of the people, they were called—were appointed from the plebeians themselves, with the power to “veto” or forbid the act of a magistrate which bore unjustly upon the conduct or fate of any citizen. Another political advance was the organization of a permanent assembly of the plebeians called by the tribunes, who could there discuss the interest of the people. After 472 B. C., plebeian assemblies had the right to elect their own tribunes and aediles. These tribunes were chosen for one year, and their number was later increased to ten. Rome, under the Republic, was thus divided into two camps—one of plebeians, directed by the tribunes, and the other of patricians, with the senate and consuls at their head.

As illustrating the power of the tribunes, we cite the story of Coriolanus, a story which later formed the basis of a Shakespearian drama. Coriolanus was a young patrician esteemed for his courage and ability. His surname, Coriolanus, was due to his capture of Corioli, a city of the Volscians, a tribe dwelling south of Latium. On the economic question he warmly supported the authority of the senate, and his attitude so irritated the tribunes that they sentenced him to exile. Going among his former enemies, the Volsci, he soon returned at the head of a powerful army and demanded the surrender of Rome. Deputies were immediately sent to recall Coriolanus from banishment and to make peace. Despite their abject entreaties he disdained to listen. Great was the city's alarm. At this juncture, Veturia,

mother of Coriolanus, with his wife, Volumnia, and her two children, followed by many noble matrons, set out from the city and advanced to the camp of the Volsci. The spectacle of the pleading mother at her son's feet was more than he could resist.

"What is it you do?" he cried, as he assisted her to rise. "You have saved Rome, but lost your son."

Returning to the Volsci, it is reported that the commander of the latter, Tullus, angry and disappointed, stirred up a tumult against Coriolanus and he was killed by the people.

Another patrician of the Quinctian family, Cincinnatus, was regarded in his day as the ablest and bravest of the Romans. It happened that his son, Kaeso, had fled from the country, having been charged by the tribunes with murder, which so affected the father that he confined himself to his little farm on the banks of the Tiber. The Volsci and Equi joined to capture the Roman city and were almost at its gates. In such urgent perils it was the custom to appoint a dictator, and, though not present, Quintius Cincinnatus was made Dictator, and messengers sent to notify him. They found him on his farm guiding his plow. On being informed of his election, he said to his wife:

"Racilia, bring me my toga!"

Going speedily to Rome and appointing an experienced old soldier, Lucius Tarquinius, general of horse, Cincinnatus thoroughly conquered the invading tribes, and in sixteen days resigned and went back to his plow, asking as his only reward that his son be pardoned and recalled from banishment. This was done.

There was always more or less dissension between plebeians and patricians and their representatives. In 454 B. C., a tribune, Icilius, succeeded in securing the Aventine hill for the plebeians, and in 450, ten commissioners were appointed

for a year, called decemviri, to draw up a system of laws. Moderate at first, all the other magistrates having been abolished, the decemviri became tyrannical later, as is illustrated in the case of one of them, Appius Claudius. Having conceived a criminal passion for a plebeian schoolgirl of fifteen, whom he accidentally saw, named Virginia, and desiring to get her into his power, he made the claim that she was one of his slaves, and had her seized. How her father, Virginius, returning from the army, slew his daughter in the place of trial rather than permit Appius, as judge, to gain her on perjured testimony, is one of the bloody reminders of the execution of justice in that period.

Repeated acts of tyranny led to the demand for written laws which resulted in the formulation of a code called the Twelve Tables, forming the basis of the most important system of law probably ever given to the world. In principle the code recognized the equality of all citizens without respect to persons, but, as it forbade marriage between patricians and plebeians and excluded the latter from holding high offices, further changes were sought and made.

Under the consuls Valerius and Horatius (448 B. C.) the assembly was given power to make laws binding upon all the people, plebeians and patricians alike, and a law (*lex Canuleia*) was passed 445 B. C., granting the right of intermarriage between the two orders, thus through social equalization, paving the way to political equality.

As just law may be regarded as the antagonist of dissension and war, so the development of law in the Roman state may be considered in some slight degree as reacting against warfare.

The earliest wars, as we have seen, took place among the tribes of the peninsula—the Romans, Sabines, and a third people called Luceres, some of whom occupied the Caelian

hill, believed to be Latins or Etruscans. The Etruscans held all the territory originally on the right bank of the Tiber, known as Etruria. With the Etruscan wars is entwined the tale of the Fabians, among the most famous of Roman patricians. Having undertaken to wage war against the Tuscans alone and at their own expense, with the exception of one person, three hundred Fabians were utterly destroyed by the Tuscans at Cremera, 477 B. C.

One of the earliest sieges of historic authenticity was that of the Etruscan city, Veii, located on the Cremera branch of the Tiber, possessing walls so strong that it was impossible to destroy or penetrate them. About this time (405 B. C.) Roman soldiers were first granted pay for their services, and the city was continuously invested for ten years (405-396 B. C.) for the purpose of starving the inhabitants into submission, and was finally captured by Camillus, who had been appointed dictator. This victory aroused the enemies of Camillus to envy and to forestall their action the senate authorized him to besiege another Etruscan city, Falerii, which the inhabitants surrendered through a curious incident. A Falerian schoolmaster treacherously led the children of the chief families into the Roman camp and offered to surrender them as hostages, but this act so disgusted Camillus that he ordered the man to be flogged by his own pupils. When the parents heard of Camillus' action they spontaneously opened their gates to him.

Nevertheless he was forced into voluntary exile by his enemies, and is said to have expressed the wish that the gods might reduce them to the necessity of regretting his absence.

Whether his prayer was of any avail or not, scarcely had he gone when Rome found itself in a desperate encounter with the Gauls. The Tuscan city of Clusium having been

attacked by them, the Tuscans applied to the Romans for aid. Three Fabian ambassadors were sent to the Gauls to arrange a peace, and in the interview one of the Fabians so far forgot his character as to kill one of the Gauls. Whereupon the Gauls, abandoning their attack on Clusium, marched upon Rome. Unskilled generals are blamed for the defeat of the Roman troops at the little river Alia and the capture of Rome, which, after three days spent in sacking it, the barbarians set on fire and reduced to a mass of ruins (390 B. C.).

According to Livy, Camillus liberated Rome and was hailed as its second founder, while Manlius, who had saved the senate building—being awakened by the cackling of geese—was accused of aspiring to absolute power, despite the fact that he sold his estates and rescued more than four hundred of his fellow citizens from imprisonment by lending them money without interest; despite all this he was accused of being a social agitator and conspirator and thrown as a traitor from Tarpeian rock. But, according to other historians, the Gauls retained their hold over Rome for some fifty years.

However, Rome rose from its ashes, raised new armies and quickly proceeded to defeat her old enemies, the Volscians, Aequians and Tuscans, who had tried to take advantage of her distress. Many towns of Latium were brought under subjection and afforded homes for the Roman poor. About this time (367 B. C.), under the leadership of C. Lucinius Stolo and L. Sextius, the Lucinian laws were enacted regulating the loaning of money, distribution and use of the land, doing away with military tribunes, and providing that one of the consuls should thereafter be a plebeian. Sextius, tribune of the people, was the first to receive this honor.

From now on, for nearly eighty years, Rome was engaged in wars relating chiefly to the conquest of the peninsula. To accomplish this she had not only to conquer the Etruscans and keep back the roving Gauls to the north, but to subdue the Oscians inhabiting the country south from Latium along the western coast, and including the Aequians, the Hernicans, and the Volscians. Also the Sabellians, living east and south of the Latins and Oscans, along the ridges and slopes of the Apennines, including the Samnites, Marsians, Picentians, Frentani, Apulians, Lucanians, and the Bruttians.

The Samnites were the most warlike people of central Italy, and had taken Capua from the Etruscans, and Cumae from the Greek colonists, and were extending into Campania. The Campanians appealed to Rome for help, promising to become Roman subjects. Though then at peace with the Samnites, Rome sent two armies into the field, one to protect Campania and the other to invade Samnium. The first army encountered the Samnites at Mt. Gaurus, near Cumae, and was victorious, driving the enemy toward the mountains, where the Samnites rallied near Suessula, and where they were again defeated by the combined Roman armies.

Shortly after this the Roman soldiers stationed at Capua for the winter mutined and threatened to take the city as their share of the conquest. This mutiny spread to the Latins, many of whom were soldiers in the Roman ranks. A law was passed assigning regular shares in the booty and regular pay, which pacified the Roman soldiers, but while the mutiny lasted the Latins had become the chief defenders of Campania against the Samnites. So the Campanians shared the defection against Rome. Curiously enough, Rome now made a treaty with the Samnites, her recent enemies, and with them attacked her former allies, the Lat-

ins and Campanians, whom she had been defending. At the battle fought on the slopes of Mt. Vesuvius (339 B. C.), the Latins were defeated, and the towns of Tibur, Praeneste, Aricia, Lanuvium, Velitrae, and Antium were conquered in quick succession. The last city, Pedum, surrendered in the third year of the war and the revolt thus came to an end.

The Samnites were jealous of the Roman increase in power and desired to gain supremacy, but were themselves threatened in the south by a new enemy, the Greeks, who were aiding the people of Tarentum and sought to extend their colonies. The twin cities of Paleopolis (old city), and Neapolis (new city), in Campania, though still in the hands of the Greeks, were under the protection of the Samnites, and as many disputes arose between the Roman settlers and the people of these cities, a second war broke out between the Romans and Samnites (326 B. C.), which continued for twenty-two years. The Romans demanded the withdrawal of the Samnite garrison, and, on being refused, besieged Paleopolis, which soon yielded to the army of Q. Publilius Philo. After capturing the strong city of Luceria in Apulia, the Apulians, and also the Lucanians, joined the Romans as allies.

However, in the fifth year of the war, 321 B. C., the Romans met with a terrible defeat. A false report being circulated that the city of Luceria was being besieged by the Samnites, an army was hastily sent to the city's relief. In passing a defile in the mountains near Caudium, the whole Roman army was entrapped and captured by the Samnite general, Pontius, who consulted his father as to the best disposition to make of the Romans. The old man said: "Either free them honorably and thus gain their friendship, or put them all to the sword and thus cripple Rome." Instead of doing either, the Roman soldiers, stripped of arms and most

of their clothing, were made to pass under the yoke and the consuls to agree to give up all the territory taken, in the belief that such a course would end the war.

But the Roman Senate disavowed the treaty and thus afforded a peculiar example of perfidy, often met with in diplomacy, especially as the generals are said to have urged this course on the Senate. The consuls who had made this unfortunate treaty were, however, handed over to the Samnites to be treated as the latter might choose.

The Senate appointed new consuls, Papirius Cursor and Publius, the best warriors of the republic, and sent them at the head of new armies against the Samnites, and the following year (320 B. C.) defeated them at Luceria. Rome now anticipated immediate success, but in this she was disappointed. The enemy had been active in securing allies. Nearly all the cities in Campania revolted. The Samnites recaptured Luceria and also Fregallae on the Liris, and gained an important victory near Anxur in southern Latium. Besides, the Etruscans revolted and attacked the Roman garrison at Sutrium. It required several years of fighting before these rebellions were thoroughly checked. After the capture of Bovianum, the chief city of the Samnites, peace was declared, and this troublesome people entered into an alliance with Rome.

Where old enmities exist wars develop on slight provocation, and the Samnites, smarting under their treatment, soon managed to incite the Umbrians, the Etruscans and the Gauls to resist the common enemy. They also entered into a compact with the Lucanians, their nearest neighbors to the south, who had been allies of Rome in the previous war. This attempt of the Samnites to control Lucania, led to a declaration of war. Rome now possessed as allies the Latins and Volscians and also the Aequians and Marsians on the east,

and the Campanians in the south. Three armies were placed in the field by the Samnites, one to defend Samnium, a second to invade Campania, and a third to enter Etruria, the last being expected to unite with the Umbrians, Etruscans and Gauls, and attack Rome from the north.

Rome got busy. The citizens flew to arms. A strong force moved into Etruria under the consuls, Q. Fabius Rulianus and Decius Mus, and scattered the hostile armies before they were fairly united. The Gauls and Samnites retreated across the Apennines to Sentinum, where a fortified camp was organized. Upon this famous field the fate of Italy was settled (298 B. C.).

Fabius commanded the right wing of the Romans and Decius Mus the left, which was during the battle driven back by a terrific charge of the Gallic war chariots. At the head of his troops Decius, following the example of his father, sacrificed himself on the altar of death, and the line was restored. A decided victory for the Romans followed. Peace was made with the Etrurians the following year, and later (283 B. C.) the Samnites and Lucanians submitted.

All governments must maintain a certain dignity, even republics, and the citizens of Tarentum, the most important of the Greek cities in Italy, having insulted a Roman ambassador, Rome declared war on that city. At this time Pyrrhus was king of Epirus in Greece, but aspired to found an empire in the west. The Tarentines appealed to Pyrrhus and asked the Romans to accept him as arbiter. This the Roman consul, Levinus, already in territory of Tarentum, refused to do, and Pyrrhus, the ablest general of his time, having landed in Italy with 25,000 troops and twenty elephants, marched against the Romans. The armies met at Heraclea, a town on the gulf of Taranto not far from Tarentum, where for the first time the Roman legions encountered the Mace-

donian phalanxes. Seven times they charged without breaking the phalanxes; when Pyrrhus turned his elephants upon the Roman cavalry, the latter fled in confusion before this unusual attack. The victor's losses were so great, however, that he sent his most trusted minister, Cineas, to Rome to propose peace. In a persuasive speech he would have effected this, had not the blind old censor, Appius Claudius, admonished the senate never to make peace with an enemy on Roman soil.

Supported by the Greek cities, the Bruttians, the Lucanians and even some of the Samnites, Pyrrhus advanced northward, and another battle was fought (279 B. C.) at Asculum near Luceria, in which the elephants again routed the Romans, but with great losses to the Greek phalanxes. Leaving his general, Milo, at Tarentum, Pyrrhus crossed over to Sicily to assist the Syracusans against the Carthaginians, whom he succeeded in driving into their stronghold, Lilybeum, at the western extremity of the island, but failed to capture the city, and called upon the people to build a fleet. As they declined to do this, regarding them as unworthy of his aid, he returned to Tarentum with the end of subduing the Romans.

An army under the consul, Curius Dentatus, was entrenched near Beneventum, among the hills of Samnium, and Pyrrhus decided to overwhelm it before it could be reinforced. The Romans had now lost their fear of elephants, and by harrassing them in the charge the fury of the bulky beasts was turned toward their own troops, and the army of Pyrrhus was forced back with great loss, he escaping to Tarentum with a small body of horses, and thence to Greece.

The victory at Beneventum (275 B. C.), with the reduction of Tarentum two years later, ended the Tarentine war. The Lucanians, Bruttians and revolting Samnites were sub-

dued; Ancona, on the east, the chief city of Picenum, taken by storm (268 B. C.), and further north Ariminum, the largest city in Umbria, was taken (266 B. C.); at this time, the subjection of Italy seemed complete. A spirit of revolt showing itself among the Etruscan cities, the walls of the most important, Volsinii, were razed to the ground, and its works of art transferred to Rome, whose supremacy was now acknowledged from the Macra and Rubicon to the straits of Sicily.

The supremacy acquired by Rome, as in the case of every other state which has risen from primitive conditions to importance, depended very largely upon the disposition and organization of its army. Under the kings, especially Servius Tullius, the army had been made the principal factor in the government. Servius, who saw the need of having plebeians pay taxes and perform military duty the same as the patricians, after dividing the territory into local districts, enrolled every able-bodied man as subject to military service. Thus he secured eighteen centuries of cavalry (*equites*), including young wealthy citizens, and one hundred and seventy-five centuries of infantry (*pedites*), comprising all others capable of bearing arms, arranged in five classes according to their wealth, as each individual had to furnish his own weapons. The first class of eighty centuries included those who could afford a brass shield for the left arm, greaves for the legs, a cuirass for the breast, and a helmet for the head, together with a sword and spear. The second class were similarly armed, but had a wooden spear covered with leather. The third differed from the second in omitting the greaves, and the fourth in omitting also the cuirass and helmet, while the fifth and poorest fought only with darts and slings. Except the first, each was arranged in twenty

centuries or companies, and one-half in each class (*juniore*s) were young men who might be called at any time, and the other half, older men (*seniore*s), constituting the reserves. Besides these one hundred and seventy-eight centuries there were fifteen centuries of carpenters, musicians and substitutes.

Now, Rome having reached the importance of a sovereign state including nearly all Italy, with colonies along the sea coast, Antium and Anxur in Latium, Minturnae in the Volscian domain, and Sinuessa in Campania, some of which required garrisons, new military dispositions and methods were instituted. As the consuls commanded, in time of war it was customary to raise four legions, two for each consul. In each legion were twenty maniples or companies, of one hundred and twenty men, and ten maniples of sixty men each, making 3,000 heavy armed troops; also 1,200 light armed troops, thus making 4,200 infantry, besides a troop of 300 horses, were usually added.

In fighting, after the time of Camillus (391 B. C.), instead of the solid square after the manner of the Greek phalanx, each legion was drawn up in three lines of battle; in front young men (*hastati*) with javelins to be hurled at the enemy before coming to close quarters; the second line (*principes*), composed of experienced soldiers, were armed similarly, and the third line (*triarii*), made up of veterans, had long lances in place of javelins. All had short swords, and for defensive armor, a brass helmet for the head, greaves for the legs, a coat of mail for the body and a shield for the left arm.

Prowess in battle was stimulated by the award of the "civic crown" of oak leaves bestowed by the general in the presence of the whole army, and by the presentation of banners of different hues, ornaments and golden crowns, the

highest honor for a general being a triumphal march to the Capitol with his prisoners and trophies of war.

The strength Rome had acquired in the peninsula contests was now to be used in other directions as a world power. Two other nations bordering on the Mediterranean had attained to the rank of world powers—Greece and Carthage—and Rome undertook to subdue them. That the proper function of a nation is war, no one at that period could well have questioned. It was only necessary to have a pretext, and pretexts are easily found where the disposition and power exists, and the selfish motive is generally distinguishable.

When the Romans were warring with Pyrrhus, the Carthaginians sent a fleet under Mago to aid them: because they desired to curtail the extension of Greek dominion. But as Rome, successful, sought to extend her influence, Carthage began to be jealous of her. Carthage was the chief merchant of the Mediterranean. Her marts were the cities of all its shores, and her wares the products of those cities and of other parts of Europe, consisting of tin from Britain, gold from Spain, silver from the Balearic Isles, linen from Egypt, frankincense from Arabia, and purple dyes from Tyre.

The first Punic war was really a contest for the control of the island of Sicily, then divided between three powers. Carthage held all the western part, including the cities of Drepanum and Lilybaeum on the west, Agrigentum on the south, and Panormus on the north; the southeastern section was controlled by the king of Syracuse, and the northeastern by Campanian soldiers, who called themselves Sons of Mars or Mamartines. These Mamartines, having committed many robberies and having murdered some of the citizens of Messina, were attacked by Hiero, King of Syracuse, who laid

siege to the city. The Mamartines asked Rome to aid them. The question of assisting these robbers as against Syracuse, a friendly power, perplexed the Roman senate; but as Carthage would undoubtedly help them if Rome refused and thus get control of the territory, it was decided by the assembly to help the Mamartines.

During the delay these sons of Mars had invited and admitted a Carthaginian garrison into the city, so that when the Roman army under Appius Claudius arrived they found the Carthaginians in possession. Claudius regarded this as a breach of faith, and at a conference between him and the Carthaginian commander, Hanno, as if to retaliate in kind, seized and imprisoned the latter. Whereupon Hanno, to secure his liberty, ordered the city given up, and the Romans took possession. For this, Hanno was crucified upon his return home. Hiero, meanwhile, having formed an alliance with the Carthaginians to expel the Romans from the island, attacked their army. But the allied forces under Hiero were defeated, and the Romans moved across the island, capturing town after town, till in the second year of the war, after a siege of seven months, Agrigentum surrendered (262 B. C.), next to Syracuse the most important city in Sicily and the seat of the Carthaginian arsenal.

By this time the energies of the two nations were fully aroused for the conflict, but they were separated by the sea, and the Romans saw the need of a navy. They possessed a few triremes with three banks of oars, but were quite unable to cope with the Carthaginian ships, quinquiremes, with five banks of oars. A Carthaginian galley stranded on the Italian coast, served them as a model, and they went to work with such ardor to construct a fleet, that one hundred and twenty vessels were built in two months. Besides they added an improvement, *corvi*, or grappling bridges, which could be

dropped at close quarters on an enemy's ship and enable the Romans to board it. Soldiers having been trained into oarsmen by means of rude banks of benches built on land, the new galleys were manned, and Duilius, the consul, as commander, went in search of the Punic fleet, the crews of which were engaged in plundering the north coast of Sicily. Relying on their long experience as sailors, the coming of the Romans was hailed with satisfaction. But as the fleets came together, the sudden drop of the grappling bridges and the onslaught of the boarders surprised them and their defeat was complete. Fifty of the Punic vessels were sunk or captured in this first naval battle of the Romans, which occurred near Mylae, 260 B. C., and Duilius was given a magnificent triumph at Rome, a column being erected in the Forum decorated with the beaks of the captured galleys.

Having constructed a larger fleet, in the ninth year of the war, the Romans decided to invade Africa. Defeating the Carthaginians' squadron, which attempted to bar their way, off the promontory of Ecnomius, on the southern coast of Sicily, two legions under L. Manlius Vulso and Regulus, landed on the coast east of Carthage, captured the port of Clypea, and proceeded to lay waste to the country. A strange omen was encountered near the river Bagrada, consisting of a serpent with scales which no dart would pierce. Finally a stone hurled from a catapult broke his back, and the skin, one hundred and twenty feet long, was sent to Rome as prophetic of a lengthy but successful war. Their invasion was so unobstructed that Vulso's legion was recalled, and Regulus left to finish the work. He soon captured Tunis, and the Carthaginians sued in vain for peace; even in despair throwing some of their children into the altar fires to propitiate their god Moloch. Xanthippus, a Spartan soldier, offered to take command of their army and was ac-

cepted. Using elephants, he defeated the Romans, destroyed their army and made Rugulus his prisoner.

The war dragged along for several years in Sicily to the advantage of the Carthaginians, when the capture of the city of Panormus, with the Punic army and one hundred elephants, turned the tide of conflict. The beasts were taken to Italy in order that the soldiers might learn how to oppose as well as manage them in warfare.

It is recorded how Regulus about this time, quite in contrast to the many perfidies related, came to Rome to offer terms of peace for Carthage, though himself urging the Senate not to accept them; and then, in accord with his word, returned as a prisoner to the Carthaginians to be executed.

In Sicily the consul, P. Claudius, failing to capture Lilybaeum, the stronghold of Punic power, decided to destroy the fleet anchored near Dreanum, but impiously disregarded the auguries. When the sacred chickens refused to eat, he threw them into the sea, exclaiming: "Then let them drink!" As a result, as was then believed, he was defeated, with a loss of over ninety ships.

Claudius was recalled by the Senate and a dictator appointed. In fighting Carthage, Rome had now lost one-sixth of its entire population, and vast treasure. Wealthy citizens advanced the money to build a fleet of two hundred new galleys, which were placed under the command of the consul C. Lutatius Catalus. A decisive victory was gained off the west coast of Sicily and the Carthaginians were compelled to sue for peace. They surrendered Sicily, released all Roman prisoners without ransom, and agreed to pay 3,200 talents (about \$4,000,000) within ten years. Thus ended the first Punic war in 241 B. C.

Sicily was the first Roman province, and a proprietor was sent to levy imposts, administer justice, and, if necessary,

command the army. Later this title seems to have had the force of our English kindred word, proprietor, though changed to proconsul. Strife being the predominant social element, Carthage now had to fight her own mercenaries, who, not having secured their pay, marched against the city to pillage it. The Punic general Hamilcar Barca, engaged the rebels, surrounded them, and exterminated them with such cruelty that this conflict became known as "the Inexpiable War."

Profiting by this rebellion of the mercenaries, Rome seized Corsica and Sardinia which had also belonged to Carthage, and because of the protest of Carthage, imposed a fine of 1,200 talents (\$1,500,000), which the latter was obliged to pay. Now for a brief period, in the year 235 B. C., the temple of Janus was closed, for the first time in 437 years, since the reign of Numa Pompilius. But new opportunities for martial valor soon presented themselves. Illyrian pirates having plundered some Greek cities about this time, Rome responded to an appeal and with a fleet of two hundred ships, cleared the Adriatic of these sea-robbers. Thus Rome secured a foothold upon the eastern coast of the Adriatic and engaged in friendly relations with Greece.

Another opportunity for war was afforded by the Gauls who lived upon the banks of the Po. From the Sybilline books it was learned with apprehension that these barbarians would twice capture Rome. According to the college of pontiffs, this prophecy would be fulfilled without danger to Rome if two Gauls were buried alive. This ceremony being performed, the consuls advanced with their army to meet the Gauls, encamped near Cape Telemon, not above three days' journey from Rome. Though superior in numbers, the Gauls were poorly equipped, and fought almost naked. Despite their fierce yells and appearance, they were

defeated with a loss of 40,000, killed and wounded (225 B. C.).

The Romans now crossed the Po for the first time, and seized Milan, the capital of the Insubres (223 B. C.). The Alpine Gauls, called Gesates, because of their skill in casting darts, came to the aid of their brethren; but were almost annihilated at Clastidium, where Viridomar, their chief, was slain in combat by the hand of the consul Marcellus (222 B. C.). This victory gave the Romans control of all northern Italy.

Perhaps the most remarkable contest in antiquity was the second Punic War, waged partly because of growing rivalry and desire for more territory, and partly for revenge. The ambition of Carthage was for trade, and her commercial opportunities had been greatly curtailed as the result of her previous war with Rome. Owing to the loss of her island possessions, she was building up an empire on the Iberian peninsula, where abounded many rich mines and other sources of wealth. Begun under Hamilcar Barca, her greatest citizen and soldier, the extension of her control was being continued to the west and north by his son-in-law, Hasdrubal, who founded New Carthage (Cartagena), on the Mediterranean coast. A treaty had been made with Rome, providing respect for the Iberian city of Saguntum to the north, and limiting the Punic conquests to the south banks of the Ebro. Hamilcar had four sons, who he regarded as lion whelps bred to fight Rome; and it is also said that the youngest, Hannibal, when a boy of nine, had taken an oath on the altar of Baal to destroy that nation. Hasdrubal died, Hamilcar was killed in battle; and at the age of twenty-six Hannibal became commander of the army. He threatened to take Saguntum, and the Iberians sent to Rome for help. At the head of 150,000 men, said to have been one-half Spaniards, and the other half Car-

thaginians, he besieged Saguntum, and after eight months, captured and reduced it to ashes. The Romans sent an army into Africa under Sempronius, and another into Spain under P. Cornelius Scipio. Hannibal decided that by carrying the war into Roman territory he could compel the withdrawal of both these armies. Accordingly leaving his brother Hasdrubal to protect Spain, he set out on a march to Italy with fifty thousand infantry, nine thousand cavalry, and thirty-seven elephants. There were no roads at that time, and though he crossed the Pyrenees in summer, he had to overcome a hundred hostile tribes on the way, and it was late in autumn before he had outflanked the barbarians who strove to oppose his passage at the River Rhone, crossed that river, and found the passes of the Little St. Bernard by which he had to force his way through snow and ice over the Alps. Men and horses perished there in great numbers and only seven elephants were left when he descended into the plains of northern Italy, where he expected to be reinforced by the Cisalpine Gauls.

The Romans had learned of this expedition, and retaining Sempronius to defend Italy, Scipio was sent by sea to Marsala to try and stop Hannibal at the Rhone; but he was too late, and so returned to Italy in time to obstruct the passage of Hannibal across the Ticinus, but was there defeated and badly wounded. Before Scipio could again rejoin the army, his colleague Sempronius had met with a still worse defeat in attempting to stop the march of Hannibal near the Trebia.

The following spring Hannibal, who had now reached the heart of Italy, was opposed by Flaminius, quite as brave but no more prudent than Sempronius. Flaminius placed his own army at Aretium in Etruria and his colleague's at Ariminum to guard the only roads by which Hannibal could approach Rome. But the wily Carthaginian crossed the Apennines and not only got his army between

the Roman armies and their Capital, but so posted it on the heights north of Lake Trasumenus as to overlook a defile through which the army of Flaminius had to pass to reach Rome. Though the Romans fought with desperation on finding themselves thus ambushed, the result was a rout; Flaminius was slain, many of his soldiers were captured, and a large number perished by throwing themselves into the lake. So furious was the battle that an earthquake which occurred at the time and destroyed several cities, was unnoticed by the combatants.

Three such bloody defeats in succession terrified the Romans. A more cautious type of man was chosen as dictator, Q. Fabius Maximus, a member of the Fabian gens which had on previous occasions proved its devotion to the country. Fabius adopted the plan of merely harassing the troops of Hannibal without coming to an open conflict, a policy he carried to such an extent that it gave him the name of Fabius Cunctator, the Delayer. He did attempt to decoy Hannibal's forces into a narrow defile of the mountains near Falerium, but Punic was more than a match for him. The Carthaginians tied bundles of dry wood to the horns of some two thousand oxen, and during the night set these bundles on fire and drove the cattle toward the heights occupied by Romans. The latter were terrified and, abandoning their posts, fled, while Hannibal escaped with his army.

The Roman people tired of Fabius and his procrastinating ways, and appointed Paulus Aemilius and Varro for their consuls, of whom it was subsequently said that Paulus had prudence enough to save, and Varro temerity enough to ruin the republic. Unfortunately for Rome, Varro's plans for conducting the war prevailed over the advice of Paulus. Hannibal's army was now in Apulia, near the town of Cannae, on the Aufidus River, to which the consuls led their

army, consisting of eighty thousand infantry and six thousand horse—the largest Roman army ever collected up to that time. Hannibal had forty thousand foot soldiers and ten thousand cavalry, but according to the report he managed to shift his position so that the rays of a scorching sun as well as the dust of a high wind struck the faces of the Romans. Varro massed his infantry and, with small squadrons of horse on either wing, charged directly at the center of Hannibal's forces, which, being a light line, as previously instructed, gave way when Varro's men found themselves attacked on each flank by heavy infantry, while strong-armed horsemen had easily swept aside their light-armed troopers, and were assaulting them from the rear. A dreadful carnage followed. Pressed on all sides, the Romans were cut to pieces. The consul Aemilius lost his life, as did sixty senators. Fifty thousand soldiers were reported as slain, and so many of the knights that three bushels of gold rings were collected from the field of the dead and sent to Carthage. Varro escaped with only seventy horsemen. Every home in Rome was in mourning.

One of Hannibal's generals, Marharbal, advised him to march straight upon the Capital; and had he followed this advice, Carthage might have become Mistress of the world instead of the city by the Tiber. It is further reported that as Hannibal declined to move his army on Rome, Marharbal said: "You know how to conquer, but not how to use your victory."

The influence of this victory was such that many tribes, like the Lucanians, Samnites, and Bruttians, became allies of Hannibal, and Capua, next to Rome the most important city in Italy, opened her gates to him. And here might be illustrated a redeeming feature in the spirit of warfare in distinction from the effects of an indolent and aimless life of ease; since here began the downward turn in Hanni-

bal's career. Hannibal imprudently selected Capua for his winter quarters. His hardy warriors were demoralized by the fascinations of an idle and sensual life. They were so enervated by gluttony and debauchery that the fortunes of their leader from that time necessarily declined. Hannibal seems to have remained at Capua with his army not merely for the winter, but for several years; and not only neighboring tribes gave him their allegiance, but Syracuse and other Sicilian cities did so as well. Besides, shortly after his arrival in Italy, he formed an alliance with Philip of Macedon. He retained the purpose with which he set out from Spain, and possessed the ambition of Alexander; he, too, might have become master of the world.

Capua was retaken by the Romans in 211 B. C., in spite of Hannibal's opposition, and many of its citizens put to death. Syracuse was also besieged and taken by Marcellus, Archimedes, the greatest mathematician of antiquity, being slain in the conflict. War was also carried into Spain and, though both the elder Scipios were slain, the consul Cornelius Scipio, son of Publius, captured New Carthage and brought over nearly all the tribes to the Roman cause. Hannibal's excuse for delay was that he was awaiting reinforcements he had asked for from Carthage. His brother Hasdrubal did succeed in evading Scipio's army and in leaving Spain with an army to assist his brother in 208 B. C., following Hannibal's path over the Alps and entering the valley of the Po, in the spring of 207 B. C. But he was met at the river Metaurus by Tiberius Claudius Nero, defeated and slain.

Scipio, having captured Gades on the western coast of Spain, as well as New Carthage on the Mediterranean, besides gaining other important victories, returned to Rome and was unanimously elected to the consulship; thereupon his plans for the conduct of the war were adopted.

Scipio, being convinced that the best way to get Hannibal

out of Italy was to attack Carthage, equipped an army, embarked from Sicily and landed in Africa. He was joined by the Numidian king, Masinissa, whom he had previously met in Spain, and whose title was disputed by a rival, Syphax, an ally of Carthage. The title to the kingship of Numidia thus became an issue in the war with Carthage. Discovering that the tents of Syphax's soldiers were composed of reeds and thatch, Scipio ordered his lieutenant, Laelius, to attack and set fire to the camp, while Scipio himself was to attack the Carthaginians. Both movements were successful, and, wellnigh overwhelmed by these disasters, the Carthaginians immediately sent messengers to recall Hannibal, who, like a lion at bay, still held his devoted army in Bruttium. Thus, with grief and indignation, accusing gods and men of thwarting him, and regretting that he had not attacked Rome immediately after the conclusion of the battle of Cannae, did Hannibal leave Italy. Landing on the African coast, he offered terms to Scipio which the latter rejected, and, though realizing the inferiority of his own army, Hannibal awaited battle on the field of Zama. He had but few of his old veterans, the new armies of Carthage could not be depended upon, and Scipio arranged his legions so that the African elephants passed between them without opposition. The result could only be one way—Hannibal was defeated and the Carthaginian army suffered annihilation. Twenty thousand were slain and as many captured.

Scipio Africanus imposed the terms of peace: 1. Carthage surrendered all Spain and the islands between Africa and Italy; 2. Masinissa was recognized as ruler of Numidia and the ally of Rome; 3. Carthage promised to pay an annual tribute of 200 talents (\$250,000) for fifty years; 4. Carthage undertook to wage no war without Rome's consent.

Exiled from Carthage at the demands of the Romans,

Hannibal still strove to raise up enemies against them in Spain, in the north of Italy, in Macedonia and Asia Minor. Refused an asylum by Antiochus the Great, this Carthaginian soldier, perhaps the greatest military strategist the world ever knew, terminated his own life by poison.

The Romans, freed from Hannibal, the most dangerous enemy they ever encountered, turned their attention toward his allies—Philip of Macedon, Antiochus of Syria, and Perseus. Pretending to take the Greek cities of the Achaean League and the Aetolian League under her protection as allies, Philip, as we have seen, was defeated at Cynoscephalae, 198 B. C., and the independence of Greece at the same time destroyed. Then Rome defeated Antiochus at the battle of Magnetia, 192 B. C., and brought Syria under control, and by the decisive battle of Pydna, 168 B. C., overthrew Perseus, and destroyed the Macedonian monarchy.

Prosperity seems to arouse the enmity of one's neighbors, and it seems to have been the inherent thrift of the Carthaginian people which caused the destruction of their city. For although the pretext for the war was found in the quarrels between Carthage and Numidia, whose king, Masinissa, was an ally of Rome, the words of Cato—"delenda est Carthago"—constituted the standing policy of the Roman Senate. Notwithstanding her appeal to Rome for the protection of their rights against Masinissa, the Senate demanded that as a guaranty to keep the peace, Carthage must surrender 300 of her noblest youths as hostages, which was done. Then the Senate urged, as they were under the protection of Rome, they must give up all their arms and munitions, which also was done. Then finally the demand was made that as the city was *fortified*, it, too, must be given up and the inhabitants remove to a point ten miles from the coast, or in other words, that "Carthage must be destroyed."

This was more than human nature could bear. Though without arms, ships or allies, a defense was resolved upon. The temples were turned into workshops for manufacturing weapons, and the women cut off their hair to make bow-strings. For three years they successfully resisted the Roman attack, when at last, Scipio Aemilianus forced a way through the wall and the city was taken street by street and house by house. Its temples were plundered and its people carried away as captives, and the city destroyed by fire, in the same year (146 B. C.) in which Corinth was destroyed—stern evidences of Rome's grim policy of dominion.

Africa became now a Roman province and Utica the new capital, where the Roman governor resided. The cities, which had been allied with Carthage, lost their lands and were compelled to pay tribute, and the whole country was Romanized as to language, manners and customs, the welfare of the people made to depend upon their loyalty to Rome.

The slave system was one of the worst results of Roman conquest. The thousands of captives taken in war from year to year were sold in the open market. Fifty thousand Carthaginians had been sent to Rome after the destruction of their city, and it is estimated that Paulus Aemilius alone, father of Scipio Aemilianus, sold into slavery one hundred and fifty thousand persons. The estates in Sicily swarmed with a servile population, and, smarting under ill-treatment, they formed a conspiracy under a leader named Eunus, and fought the power of Rome for three years (132-129 B. C.). Some two hundred thousand insurgents enrolled under the banner of Eunus, and not till four armies were defeated and Rome thrown into consternation was the rebellion finally crushed and Sicily pacified. It may be noted as an anomaly that Rome acquired one piece of territory without war. In

the year prior to the insurrection in Sicily, at the death of Attalus III, King of Pergamum, in Asia Minor, "after killing all his heirs, ended a life of folly by bequeathing his kingdom to the Roman people." The kingdom was organized as a province under the name of "Asia."

While Numantia was being reduced and the rebellion quelled in Sicily dissensions were arising in Rome, leading to bloody contests and the destruction of the republic. These conflicts grew largely out of the efforts of two brothers—Tiberius and Caius Gracchi, grandsons, by their mother Cornelia, of the first Scipio Africanus—to correct some of the evils resulting from the holding of large estates and the employment of slave labor. It was said of Tiberius Gracchus, the elder brother, that when passing through the province of Etruria he was greatly shocked to observe the fields being tilled by groups of slaves, with thousands of free citizens standing in idleness, and accordingly, when elected tribune, 133 B. C., he immediately attempted to remedy this evil. He endeavored to revive the Licinian laws, to limit the holdings of public lands to three hundred acres for each person, to pay previous holders for improvements, and to rent the land taken up to poorer classes of citizens. If passed, this law would have deprived the wealthy of lands long possessed, and the senate opposed it; one of the tribunes, M. Octavius, putting his "veto" upon its passage.

Tiberius determined to enact the law in spite of the senate, and instead of waiting for a new election he called upon the people to deprive Octavius of his office. This was promptly done, and the law passed. The senators now determined to prosecute Tiberius when his term of office should expire. But Tiberius announced himself as a candidate for re-election, in which, though contrary to existing law, he was supported by the popular party. On election day, two tribes

having already voted in his favor, a band of senators, headed by Scipio Nasica, appeared in the Forum, armed with sticks and clubs, and in the ensuing riot Tiberius and three hundred of his followers were slain.

For a time following his death the agrarian law which had been passed was carried into effect, but the people lacked leadership and Caius Gracchus, nine years younger than his brother, was selected as a suitable person to champion their cause. He was elected tribune (123 B. C.), and succeeded in securing the passage of a law by which any Roman citizen could obtain grain from the public storehouse for a price something less than its cost. This was intended to reduce the number of paupers, but seems to have had the reverse effect. The poor now flocked to Rome from the remotest parts to be fed from the public crib; so that in a few years there were three hundred and twenty thousand citizens dependent upon the state for their sustenance. Caius became very popular with this class; nevertheless, personal ambition and thrift were weakened among the people by the passage of the law. The agrarian laws initiated by Tiberius were also renewed, and Caius provided for sending colonies of poor citizens into the provinces. He also championed and passed a law taking away from the senate the right to furnish jurors in criminal cases, giving the same right to the wealthy class, or equites; and, on his re-election, succeeded in passing a measure for extending the franchise to all the people of Italy. This, his wisest measure, destroyed his popularity, as even the poorer classes of Romans did not desire to share their rights with foreigners. So strenuous were the few followers of Caius in his behalf, however, that the consul Opimius, with a body of armed men, marched against him and routed his attendants. Three thousand citizens were slain in the tumult (121 B. C.). Abandoned

by the multitude, for whom he had sacrificed himself, Caius ordered a slave to kill him. Opimius had offered, it is said, to pay its weight in gold for the head of Caius, but the slave obeyed his master and then slew himself. Thus perished the Gracchi, who had attempted to relieve the Roman people from the ills of a corrupt government.

About the time Caius Gracchus was being proscribed and slain a variety of conflicts was occurring in Italy and in the provinces. The small land areas created by Tiberius Gracchus had been swallowed up in large estates; heavy taxes prevailed; the slaves were threatening rebellion; the seas swarmed with pirates, and the barbarians were threatening to invade the frontiers.

While these dangers threatened, the attention of the senate was directed to a conflict in Africa, the chief interest in which to-day is that it illustrates something of the extent of Roman corruption which then prevailed. Jugurtha, the nephew of Masinissa, on the latter's death, had murdered his two sons and made himself sole king of Numidia, a country which was an ally of Rome. A protest being made, commissioners were sent to settle the matter, who, however, sold themselves to Jugurtha as soon as they landed in Africa. The Roman people were incensed, and a war against the Numidian king declared. L. Calpurnius Bestia, the consul in whose hands the conduct of the war was placed, on arriving in Africa also accepted Jugurtha's gold and made peace. Because of renewed indignation Jugurtha was summoned to Rome, and immediately came. When he appeared to make his statement a tribune who had also been bribed ordered him to desist. Meanwhile this Numidian having the audacity to cause the murder of another rival, grandson of Masinissa, then in Rome, was expelled and, returning to Africa, took command of his own army against the Romans.

The new consul, Q. Caecilius Metullus, having chief command, employed as his lieutenant Caius Marius, a soldier who had risen from the ranks, but whose success was so great that he was elected consul and superseded Metullus in the supreme command. His defeat of Jugurtha smacks of the latter's own methods. Marius sent Sulla, his quaestor, to Bocchus, King of Mauritania, and an ally of Jugurtha, to intimate that he might purchase the friendship of the Romans by delivering Jugurtha to them. Despite the offer of a large sum by Jugurtha if he would deliver over Sulla to him, the advantages of a Roman alliance seemed so great that having invited the Numidian to an interview, he seized the latter, loaded him with chains and gave him up to Sulla. The name and wars of Jugurtha have been immortalized by Sallust. Jugurtha was exposed in Rome to the view of the people and dragged in chains to adorn the triumph of Marius. He was afterwards placed in prison, where he died at the end of six days from hunger (106 B. C.).

While Marius was settling affairs in Africa the Teutons and Cimbri, among the fiercest of northern tribes, had pushed down from the southern part of Gaul and overrun the new province of Narbonensis, established the year following the death of Caius Gracchus. It had been found very difficult to stay the course of these savages. In a battle fought at Arausia, near the Rhone, in 107 B. C., an army of eighty thousand Roman soldiers was destroyed; and had the victors not stopped to ravage the country of southern Gaul, Rome itself might have been taken.

Marius reached the banks of the Rhone with his army. The Cimbri had turned aside to plunder in Spain, but they soon returned and prepared to cross the Alps into the north-west of Italy, while the Teutons were moving to the same goal directly from the west. Against the latter Marius pro-

jected his own army and sent his colleague, Q. Lutatius Catulus, to meet the Cimbri. In the battle of Aquae Sextiae, near Aix, he formed an ambushade and annihilated the Teutonic hosts. The next day he received the news of his election for the fifth time to the consulship. Though it was contrary to law to re-elect a consul immediately after a term of service, the Romans seem to have believed that "in the midst of arms the laws are silent" (102 B. C.).

Meanwhile the Cimbri had crossed the Alps and driven Catulus across the Po. Marius hastened at the head of his victorious troops to join him and meet the invaders. The Cimbri, not knowing of the fate of the Teutons, sent deputies to the consul demanding lands and cities sufficient for themselves and brethren.

Three days later a fierce battle occurred in what is now known as the *Raudine Fields*, to the south of Vercelli, where the Cimbri were nearly exterminated (101 B. C.).

Marius, given a magnificent triumph and hailed as a second Camillus and a third Romulus, was now at the height of popularity. None had ever surpassed him in this respect in Rome. The two principal aspirants for popular leadership were Saturninus and Glaucia, and with these Marius allied himself and was elected consul for the sixth time. Opposition, urged on by certain senators, developed, however, and resulted in bloody tumults. The senate demanded that Marius as consul should put down the revolt. Loath to make war upon the people, his former friends, he reluctantly complied, and both his colleagues, Saturninus and Glaucia, were killed in the conflict. This threw him into disrepute and the senate took the reins of government. The Roman allies, though having furnished soldiers for the armies, had not received their rights as citizens and demanded that all Italians should have equal political rights.

A tribune, M. Livius Drusus, in order to please the people, proposed an increase in the largesses of grain, the introduction of a cheap copper coin to possess the same value as the previous silver one, that jurors should be selected from both the senatorial and equites classes, and finally, that all Italians should be granted the Roman franchise.

Attempting to begin by uniting equites and people to pass the first two of these laws, he found the senate violently opposed and much violence ensued. Although the laws were passed, the senate declared them null and void. Ignoring this act of the senate, Drusus proposed that the assembly should grant the franchise to the Italians, but found himself opposed, and was later murdered by an unknown assassin. His death led the Italians to organize a separate republic, with the government at Corfinium, in the Apennines. It was modeled after that of Rome, with five hundred members in the senate, with two consuls and other officers, and included as its subjects nearly all the people of central and southern Italy.

Rome was now thoroughly aroused. A hundred thousand men took the field against as many armed for rebellion. Marius, made commander the first year, was, on account of his age, superseded the second year by L. Cornelius Sulla. An army under Pompeius Strabo captured Corfinium, the first capital; and the second capital, Bovianum, was captured by Sulla. Three hundred thousand men lost their lives in the war, but Italy was permanently incorporated with Rome, and the following year (89 B. C.) practically all the inhabitants of the peninsula became citizens alike.

And now is well illustrated the oft-time petty character of the human disposition when inflated with the possession of power. Marius was mortified that he should thus be superseded by Sulla, and to regain his status with the people

joined fortunes with the tribune P. Sulpicius Rufus, the most popular leader. By the aid of an armed force the "Sulpician laws" were passed, displacing Sulla and turning the army over to Marius. At this unheard of procedure, Sulla appealed to his army, then in Campania, which responded favorably, and he marched upon Rome, settling the question in the streets of the capital. Marius and Sulpicius were expelled, the laws passed by the latter annulled, and the senate clothed with power to approve or reject any law before submitting it to the people.

How Marius, as a wandering exile, was captured and condemned to death at Minturia, how he over-awed the executioner by asking if he dared "to kill Caius Marius," was ordered away from the ruins of Carthage, where he had taken refuge, and then came back and took command of an army raised by his friend, the consul L. Cornelius Cinna, will be recalled as among the events which followed.

Sulla had with his army gone to the East, so Marius and Cinna had little difficulty in capturing Rome. The gates were closed, and the ghastly head of the other consul, C. Octavius, friend of Sulla, was the first to be suspended in the Forum. Then the heads of the chief senators were hung up. Marius seems to have become a veritable madman reveling in slaughter. The city afforded a continuous performance of murder, plunder and outrage. No one was safe if friendly to Sulla; his supporters were slain on sight. Marius and Cinna declared themselves consuls. Fortunately, perhaps, Marius died shortly after entering upon this, his seventh consulship. Cinna continued to rule with despotic power. He renamed himself consul each year and selected his own colleague. Hearing of the approach of Sulla he determined to prevent his landing, but was killed by one of his own men (83 B. C.).

Sulla had gone to the East to save that part of the Roman domain from complete conquest. Mithridates the Sixth, or the Great, king of Pontus, taking advantage of the social war in Rome, and having caused a hundred thousand Italian residents of Asia Minor to be massacred in a single day, sent his armies into Greece, and many of the cities there, including Athens, had declared in his favor. Sulla displayed here, perhaps, his greatest ability as a soldier. He repelled the army of Mithridates and laid siege to Athens, which surrendered after a long and valiant resistance (87 B. C.). Then he marched against the army of Archelaus, the most skillful general of Mithridates, encountering him at Chaeronea (86 B. C.), and cut his army to pieces.

Archelaus himself escaped and, reinforced with a still larger army, fortified himself at Orchomenus, where Sulla attacked him the following year. At the outset the engagement was unfavorable to the Romans. The vast number of the enemy threw them into consternation and they took to flight. Sulla, at the sight, dismounted and, seizing a standard, advanced alone toward the foe, crying out: "When you Romans are asked where you abandoned your general, say at Orchomenus!"

At this, his soldiers returned to the charge and put the barbarians to flight. Nearly the entire force of Archelaus was buried in the neighboring marshes, where they fled for refuge, and it was two days before Archelaus himself contrived to escape.

Mithridates now authorized Archelaus to make peace, and the latter being aware of the necessity which urged Sulla to return to Italy, where his party was being oppressed by that of Marius, offered him a large sum, sufficient to pay his expenses in Italy, if he would abandon the East to Mithridates.

Sulla, on the contrary, urged Archelaus to make war on

Mithridates, promising him his own assistance. Archelaus declared his detestation of such treachery. "What," exclaimed Sulla, "do you, the minion of a barbarian king, regard it base to betray your master, yet dare to propose like treason to Sulla, a Roman general, as if you were not that Archelaus who concealed himself with the remnants of his army in the plains of Orchomenus?"

Abashed at this answer, Archelaus accepted the terms offered. Mithridates hesitated in signing the treaty, as it required him to surrender his fleet. This irritated Sulla. "Why should your master cavil," he said to the deputies, "about the delivery of his ships, when he should have entreated me on his knees to spare the hand which had signed the order for the death of so many Romans?" Mithridates yielded his conquests, his fleet consisting of eighty war vessels, and paid 3,000 talents (\$3,750,000) indemnity (85 B. C.).

Sulla's landing in Italy with a victorious army of forty thousand men, was the signal for civil war. The leaders of the party in power since the death of Cinna, were Gaius Papirius, Q. Sertorius, and the younger Marius. Altogether he found fifteen generals and more than two hundred thousand men armed against him. But Sulla's reputation and the hatred entertained by many for the Marian faction, drew a crowd of soldiers to his standard. Among these were Pompeius Strabo and Crassus. Sulla marched to Campania and defeated one consul, while the other consul's troops deserted to him in a body. Then he attacked young Marius in Latium, routed his army and shut him up in the town of Praeneste. Meanwhile northern Italy was held in check by Pompey, and a desperate battle was fought at Clusium in Etruria, where the forces of Sulla and Pompey defeated those of Garbo. The Samnite general, Telesinus, having evaded

Sulla and Pompey by a skillful march, formed the design of capturing Rome, which he knew to be defenseless. Without giving his own troops any rest Sulla followed and made an immediate attack upon the Samnites under the walls of Rome. The latter were defeated and six thousand prisoners were put to death.

Sulla was now supreme ruler, and he seemed to emulate the disposition of Marius in the character of vindictive measures. First he outlawed all the civic and military officers who had taken any part against him, offering a reward of two talents (\$2,500) for the murder of each and every one. Accompanying this was a list of those he desired to have killed. There were eighty names on the first list, two hundred and twenty on the second, and these lists continued to be issued till nearly five thousand Roman citizens had been slain as the result of this proscription. Nor was this all. Similar lists were sent to every city in Italy. The historian Plutarch says: "Neither temple nor hospitable hearth, nor father's house, was free from murder." For many months the executions continued, and among the slain were ninety senators and more than two thousand knights. At Praeneste, Sulla having no time to examine each individual, ordered all the people to be collected to the number of twelve thousand, and then slaughtered on the spot. The heads of many victims on Sulla's order were piled in the streets of Rome for execration, and the tomb of Marius was broken open and his ashes scattered.

Besides these wholesale murders of his own fellow-citizens, Sulla confiscated the lands of Italy, destroyed cities, and laid whole districts waste.

Sulla now made himself dictator, a device for the absolute power he coveted. All his previous acts were then con-

firmed, and his twenty-three legions of soldiers were disbanded and scattered through Italy, as citizens, yet subject to his commands. Thus Sulla fixed his power upon a military basis.

The senate was restored to its position as a ruling body, its three hundred members to be elected from among the patricians. Jurors in criminal trials thereafter were to be taken from the senate, and no laws were to be passed by the assembly of the tribes until first approved by the senate. To keep control of the elections, Sulla enfranchised ten thousand slaves ("cornelii"), giving them the right to vote. Tribunes were allowed to "intercede" but not to vote. He also reformed the criminal courts.

Sulla has been characterized as "a man of blood and iron." Resigning his dictatorship, after giving the government, as he supposed, safely into the hands of the senate, he retired to his villa at Pulioli, on the Bay of Naples, where he died the following year (78 B. C.), as the result, it is said, of debauchery and licentiousness.

Scarcely was the death of Sulla announced before one of the consuls, M. Aemilius Lepidus, aspiring to become leader of the popular party, proposed to restore the tribunes to their former prerogatives and rescind the Sullan constitution. With this plan, his colleague, Q. Lutatius Catulus, had no sympathy and raised strong opposition against it. The senate, foreseeing serious difficulty, bound the two consuls under oath not to resort to arms, but Lepidus, despite his oath to the contrary, raised an army and marched upon Rome. Catulus, with the aid of Cneius Pompey, soon defeated him, however, a circumstance which brought the name of Pompey into considerable prominence (77 B. C.).

Q. Sertorius, a supporter of Marius, had escaped to Spain during the Sullan proscription. He was a man characterized

as of noble character, prudent, generous and brave, as well as able in war. Many of the proscribed had taken refuge in Spain, and the native tribes were growing restless under the tyranny of Roman governors. Sertorius formed the plan of setting up an independent republic and delivering Spain from the power of Rome. This plan was agreed upon, and, seconded by the Lusitanians, he created a senate of three hundred members, organized the cities after the Italian model, and founded schools for instruction in the arts and one at Osca for classical culture. It was rumored among the Lusitanians that he was one favored by heaven and had received from Diana a white hind which told him the secrets of the future.

Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius, being despatched against him with a large army, was promptly defeated, and then the young pro-consul Pompey was treated in the same manner, and might have lost his entire army had not Metellus come to his assistance. The story was circulated that Sertorius in a fit of wrath had caused the boys in his school at Osca to be put to death, and not long afterwards he was, in fact, murdered by one of his lieutenants, Perpenna. According to one account the Roman generals had put a price upon his head and he was assassinated at a feast (73 B. C.).

The Romans seem to have delighted in the display of bloody contests, and training schools existed in different parts of Italy for preparing gladiators for mortal combats in the arena. At Capua, in one of these prison schools, a brave Thracian named Spartacus, endowed with immense strength, incited his comrades to revolt. Rather than be "butchered to make a Roman holiday," "let us fight," he said, "against our oppressors!"

Seventy of them escaped and made the crater of Vesuvius, which was then a dry bed, a stronghold. This body grew

into an aggregation of one hundred thousand men, and, having equipped themselves with plundered arms, they seem to have placed all Italy at their mercy. They defeated four Roman armies in succession, but were finally routed by M. Crassus. Cneius Pompey meeting a remnant of five thousand of them on the banks of Silanus that were endeavoring to escape into Gaul, secured the honor of putting an end to the servile war. In this last combat the valiant Spartacus was slain.

Owing largely to the decline of the Roman navy, the sea had become infested with pirates which preyed upon the cities of the Mediterranean coast, held up and plundered ships and had become a menace and terror to the nations. Their rendezvous extended from the island of Crete along the coast of Cilicia, and they cut off the supplies of grain to such an extent that Italy was threatened with a famine. In this emergency an extraordinary law was passed giving Pompey supreme control of the sea and its coasts for fifty miles inland for three years. He was also granted five hundred ships and as many men as he might desire. In fact this *lex Gabinia* gave him unlimited command of the nation's treasury and resources. But, as it proved, public confidence in him was not misplaced. As Cicero subsequently said: "Pompey had made his preparations for war at the end of the winter, began it in early spring and finished it in mid-summer." He captured three thousand vessels, and slew ten thousand of the enemy in the operation, besides taking twenty thousand prisoners, thus clearing the Mediterranean of this pest.

While Rome was battling with Spartacus at home and Sertorius in Spain, Mithridates had taken advantage of the situation to attack the Roman provinces of Asia Minor. He laid siege to Cyzicus, an important town on the Propontis, when L. Lucinius Lucullus, having been despatched with an army

from Rome, compelled him to abandon his enterprise. He destroyed the army of Mithridates at the passage of the Granicus, where Alexander had defeated the Persian armies two hundred and sixty years previously.

Lucullus, it appears, had but fifteen thousand men, but he boldly entered Armenia and ordered his army to advance. The Armenians were astonished at the onslaught of the Romans, and their flight resulted in a slaughter. According to the reports, while the Romans lost but five killed and one wounded, the Armenians lost fifty thousand men, with the loss of the neighboring countries, and the capture of Tigranocerta, with all the royal treasures.

Made wiser by his defeat, Tigranes, King of Armenia, turned over his command to Mithridates, who adopted the policy of harassing the Romans and cutting off their supplies. But Lucullus, discovering that Tigranes had deposited his chief treasures in Artaxata, marched against that city, thus causing the two kings to defend it. At the first onset the enemy fled, and this defeat resulted in the conquest of all of Armenia, 68 B. C. Lucullus being recalled to Rome, however, the kings of Armenia and Pontus soon drove the inexperienced Roman leaders, with their small armies, out of the country.

Rome becoming uneasy at the successes of this eastern king, a law was passed (*lex Manilia*, B. C. 66) recalling Lucullus and giving Pompey supreme control over all the Roman territory in the East. Thus authorized, Pompey, whose ambitions had been aroused by his previous successes, eagerly undertook the new enterprise. In one short campaign he almost annihilated the forces of the unfortunate monarch, who was abandoned by all his friends. His son-in-law, King Tigranes, not only refused his assistance, but even set a price upon his head. Mithridates had resolved to

emulate Hannibal by carrying the war into Italy, but his soldiers revolted and refused to follow him. As if to settle the matter, they proclaimed his son, Pharnaces, king, who, it is said, was eager to deprive his father of both crown and life. In fact, Mithridates became at last the victim of parricide.

Meanwhile Pompey invaded Syria and took possession of that kingdom. He next entered Judea, captured Jerusalem and took possession of Phoenicia, and reduced to Roman provinces all the countries beyond the Euphrates. He made peace with Pharnaces and Tigranes, and the latter became tributaries to the Roman republic (63 B. C.).

Sergius Cataline, a former partisan of Sulla's, and once praetor, had twice been defeated for the consulship. Smarting under these slights and ruined in fortune, he conceived the horrible design of murdering the senators, firing the city of Rome, seizing the wealth which might be secured from the city's treasury and plundering the rich. Fortunately for the state the conspiracy was disclosed by one of the conspirators to the consul, Cicero, who denounced him in his famous orations, one of which was delivered in the Senate while Cataline was present, and caused him to take refuge in his camp in Etruria. There he was defeated and slain with three thousand of his followers. Five of his fellow-conspirators were subsequently condemned to death, and Cicero put the Senate's order into execution (62 B. C.).

On returning to Italy from his eastern conquests, Pompey, like Sulla previously, was given a magnificent triumph. Unlike Sulla, however, he disbanded his army at the seashore, thinking the merit of the victories he had achieved would induce the senate to confirm his treaties in the East and reward his veterans with grants of land.


The influence of Lucullus, who had been deposed in the

same field, prevailed with the senate. However, the latter declined to confirm Pompey's acts or reward his soldiers, and thus Pompey came to have a grievance against that body.

It happened that another individual, one Gaius Julius Caesar, also had a pique against the Senate. Caesar had been refused a triumph on his return from Spain, and, having held the offices of military tribune, quaestor, aedile, pontifex maximus, and praetor, he felt his dignity insulted. Accordingly, Caesar and Pompey entered into a coalition, to which Crassus, another aspirant for wealth and honor, was admitted.

By the power of these three men (Triumvirs), Caesar was first made consul, then all the acts of Pompey in the East were confirmed, and an agrarian law passed providing for his veterans, and which also assigned sections of land in Campania to needy Roman citizens. A law remitting one-third the amount successful bidders had offered for the privilege of collecting the taxes of Asia, was especially pleasing to Crassus, and to certain capitalists involved in the transaction. Caesar, as consul, was notable for the amount he accomplished. At the close of his term Caesar was made governor of Cisalpine Gaul, which then meant little more than the valley of the Po; Illyricum, a strip north of Macedonia across the Adriatic Sea, and Norbonensis, a territory about the lower part of the Rhone.

In selecting Gaul for his province, Caesar must have decided that Rome thereafter should be a military power which would control the political; that Gaul being the nearest province in which to attain military prestige, the conquest of Gaul was necessary to the protection of Rome, as it had already been twice invaded from the north, and finally, that Rome and Italy, overcrowded, needed new lands for colonization.



CAESAR

Within the period of eight years he brought under Roman authority all the territory bounded by the Rhine, Alps, the Pyrenees and the Atlantic, or what now corresponds to a part of Switzerland, the whole of France, Belgium, and a part of Holland. According to his own *Commentaries*, he first conquered the Helvetii, north of Narbonensis. This stirred up Ariovistus, a German leader, who crossed the Rhine and threatened the conquest of the province, and whom Caesar was compelled to meet and repulse. Then the Nervii were subdued in northern Gaul, with other tribes. Next he conquered the Veneti on the Atlantic coast and subdued Aquitania. In 55 B. C., he made his first invasion of Britain, landing at Deal, nearest France, and in another expedition the following year conquered a part of the country. Then Caesar quelled an insurrection and completed the conquest of Gaul, a conquest among the most important events of the world's history (51).

It was a favorite method with Roman politicians, and not entirely obsolete even in this day, to have political rivals removed with as little friction and public notice as possible. Cicero and Cato were the most influential men in the senate, and it seems to have been the function assigned to one Clodius, a tribune, whose hostility to the senate could be depended upon, to stay their influence. Cyprus having been annexed to the Roman domain, Cato was disposed of by being appointed governor to that island. Clodius then succeeded in passing a law that any judge guilty of putting a Roman citizen to death without trial should be banished, and as this clearly referred to the execution of Cataline's associates by Cicero, the latter retired to Greece and devoted himself to literature.

The bonds holding the Triumvirate together were weakening. Crassus, after taking control of his province in

Syria, formed the plan of making war against Parthia, with the design of pursuing his conquests into India, where he expected to secure great treasures. He had already pillaged the temple at Jerusalem, and to the complaint of the Parthian king that the treaty of neutrality between them had been violated Crassus sent word that he would answer when at Selencia, the Parthian capital. Marching along the Euphrates, and conveying his supplies by boats on the river, he was induced to turn aside into the plains of Mesopotamia, where in a few days he found himself in an arid desert without water or provisions. Near Carrae he was attacked by the Parthians and compelled to retreat. Surena, the Parthian general, under a pretext of making peace, drew him into a conference and seized his person. In vain his guards tried to defend Crassus. They and their general were slain. The cupidity and ambition which had led him to engage in an unrighteous war had resulted in a shameful death.

Pompey had been appointed "sole consul" in order to meet an emergency. The city had been distracted by street broils between armed bands of men, one in the interests of Clodius, and the other followers of T. Ammus Milo, who claimed to be defending the Senate. Clodius was killed in one of these conflicts, his body was burned in the Forum by the infuriated mob, and the senate house set on fire and consumed. Pompey restored order, and was so highly regarded for this act that the senate renewed his authority in Spain for five years.

The death of Crassus destroyed the equilibrium in the relations of Pompey and Caesar. Each wished to reign and to reign alone, and Pompey's appointment as *sole consul*, however urgent, was not calculated to allay any feelings of jealousy which might exist in the mind of Caesar. Caesar remembered this at a meeting in Lucca (56 B. C.), where the

triple alliance was renewed; it was there agreed that he should receive the consulship at the close of his last five years in Gaul, and Caesar wished to retain control of his army till elected to that office. Cato had threatened to prosecute him as soon as he ceased to be pro-consul. Accordingly, Caesar asked the privilege of being, while absent from Rome, a candidate for the following year. He offered to give up his province and his army if Pompey would do likewise, but Pompey declined to do so.

The senate now asked Caesar for two of his legions to use in the Parthian war. Caesar complied, but instead of being sent to the East they were stationed in Campania. Caesar was then asked to send more of his legions, and he agreed to give up eight more, if permitted to retain two in Cisalpine Gaul till the time of election. The senate would not accede to this and declared that he must relinquish his province and entire army by a certain date or be regarded as a public enemy. It was war or peace, and he chose war.

Assembling his troops he crossed the Alps, and, arriving at the banks of the Rubicon, the stream separating his province, he is reported to have said: "What misery may I bring upon my country if I pass this river, but to hesitate is to lose. The die is cast. The injustice of my enemies calls me." Crossing the river he hastened to Rimini, which he seized. Pompey, unprepared for so sudden a move, as he could not rely upon the two legions which the senate had taken from Caesar, withdrew to Brundisium. Caesar followed, but Pompey managed to escape to Dyrrachium, and as Caesar had no fleet, he returned to Rome. The citizens there recalled the proscription of Sulla, but Caesar's moderation reassured them, and, in fact, brought him many supporters.

Pompey had an army with him in Greece and another in

Spain under his lieutenants; so Caesar was between the two. Having no fleet he despatched his Gallic legions across the Pyrenees into Spain, and, after quieting the fears of the Roman people, joined his army, there besieged Marseilles, and soon defeated the forces under lieutenants of Pompey. On returning to Rome he found himself proclaimed dictator, an office he modestly declined, contenting himself with that of consul.

In October, 49 B. C., Caesar, having collected his army and what ships he could, transported his army into Epirus. Pompey had meanwhile assembled a powerful army at Dyrrachium, and in the first attack Caesar was repulsed. Retreating then across the peninsula, in order to draw Pompey away from his supplies, Caesar awaited his pursuing army at Pharsalia in Thessaly, where their forces joined battle May 12, 48 B. C. Caesar had but twenty thousand men, and Pompey double that number, but, perceiving that Pompey's cavalry were superior in numbers and efficiency, Caesar placed six cohorts of infantry, especially equipped, behind his own few squadrons of horse in order to throw the enemy's horse into disorder when they should attempt to turn his flank. He expressly told these cohorts that upon them he relied for victory. As Pompey anticipated, his cavalry easily put that of Caesar to flight, but then advancing to turn the flank, they were thrown into irretrievable disorder, and these six cohorts continuing their charge upon the infantry, with Caesar's other cohorts closing in from all sides, the result was a rout of Pompey's forces. "The battle of Pharsalos," says Freeman, "is one of the most important battles in history, as it really ended the *Roman Commonwealth*, and began the *Roman Empire*, which we may almost say has gone on ever since."

Pompey fled in the dress of a civilian from the battlefield

of Pharsalos to the mouth of the Peneus, where he sailed for Egypt, expecting to find a friend in King Ptolemy, whom he had previously instructed and assisted. But Ptolemy, basely, thought this an opportunity to gain the friendship of Caesar. Pompey was invited to land, and then, in sight of his wife, Cornelia, was murdered in cold blood.

Caesar set out from Greece in pursuit of Pompey, and was greatly shocked on arriving in Alexandria to find his late rival killed and his head presented to him. The great conqueror is reported to have shed tears at the sight. Shortly afterwards, as a result of a different form of emotion, he was fascinated by the charms of Cleopatra and adjudged her the crown of Egypt in place of her brother, Ptolemy. Highly displeased at this, Ptolemy, with a strong army, attacked Caesar who entrenched himself in the palace at Alexandria. Though having less than four thousand men, the Roman general successfully resisted till reinforcements arrived, when his legions charged and put the entire Egyptian army to the sword. Ptolemy was drowned in the river Nile, thus rewarded for the murder of his friend Pompey, his former tutor and benefactor.

On his way back to Rome, Caesar passed through Asia Minor, where, as he had been informed, Pharnaces, the son and assassin of Mithridates, late king of Pontus, was stirring up a revolt in that kingdom. His progress was so rapid and so quickly did he destroy the army of Pharnaces and restore order in the Asiatic provinces, that he made his report in the famous words: "*Veni, vidi, vici.*" Returning to Rome, Caesar was made dictator for ten years.

The Pompeian leaders in Africa, including Cato, great-grandson of Cato the Elder, and Mettels Scipio, were not yet subdued. Pompey's former lieutenant, Labienus, was also in Egypt, and with the assistance of the King of Nu-

midia these officers determined to make a last stand against the conqueror.

In this expedition, when Caesar landed on the African shore, it is said he fell prostrate; but to prevent any inference of ill-omen, he cried out: "Africa, I seize thee!"—a claim which subsequent events sustained. At the battle of Thapsus, Cato, held in the bounds of Utica, resolved not to survive the ruin of his party. While reflecting on the philosophy of the Phædo, Plato's dialogue on the immortality of the soul, he ended his life by throwing himself on his sword (46 B. C.).

Following the battle of Thapsus, Labienus had gone to Spain to take command of one of the armies which the two sons of Pompey had mustered in that province. Caesar hastened thither and found the enemy entrenched in the southern part of the province, near the city of Munda. The battle occurred March 17, 45 B. C. The first charges of his troops were unfavorable, and Caesar, it is said, on seeing his legions give way, seized a shield and advanced within ten paces of the enemy. This had the effect of reanimating his veterans, and the camp of the Pompeians, as well as the town of Munda was taken by assault. The Pompeians lost thirty thousand men and Caesar but fifteen hundred killed and wounded. One of the sons of Pompey was slain with Labienus, and the fate of the other son was probably the same, as he was never heard of afterwards (45 B. C.).

The victory at Munda may be said to have given peace to the whole world, as Caesar controlled Rome and had no more enemies to subdue. On his return four splendid triumphs were given him—one for Gaul, one for Egypt, one for Pontus, and one for Numidia. No reference to the civil war was made and no Roman citizens were in the procession of his captives. No massacres, no proscriptions, no confisca-

tions followed. Caesar was great enough to forgive his enemies and to grant equal rights to friend and foe alike.

Caesar reformed the provincial system by making each governor directly responsible to the dictator, thus putting a check upon the system of robbery in the collection of taxes. He reformed the calendar in a way which has been accepted to the present day. He ordered the rebuilding of Carthage and of Corinth, and his plans included codifying the Roman laws, providing for public libraries, improving the city architecture, draining the Pontine marshes, cutting a canal through the Isthmus of Corinth, and extending the empire to the Euphrates, the Danube and the Rhine.

He reduced the number of persons in Rome to whom grain was distributed from three hundred and twenty thousand to one hundred and fifty thousand, because he believed the government should not help those able to provide for themselves. He provided means of employment for the idle by constructing new buildings and other public works, and enforced the law requiring one-third the labor on landed estates to be free labor, and enacted a bankrupt law by which a debtor could escape imprisonment by turning over any property he possessed to his creditors.

He believed that one man should control in government, but for the benefit of all. He enlarged the senate to nine hundred members, of all classes—sons of freedmen as well as nobles; Gauls and Spaniards as well as military officers. It was to be a body for advising the sovereign of the needs of all sections, and he extended the franchise to the utmost limits of the realm.

Caesar was made perpetual dictator, while the titles of "Imperator" and "Father of his Country" were voted to him. Public buildings and temples were filled with his statues, while religious rites, festivals and sacrifices were de-

creed to him. It is said that the senate granted such extravagant honors for the purpose of making him odious with the people, and that, not seeing the snare, Caesar allowed himself to be dazzled and misled.

He had contemplated a war against the Parthians to avenge the death of Crassus. According to the Sibylline books it was pretended the Parthians could be conquered only by a *king*, and so it was proposed that Caesar should bear the title of Dictator in Italy but *King* in all the countries conquered. This proposition led to a conspiracy instigated by Brutus, Cassius and others, all of whom were more or less under obligations to Caesar.

The day this title was to be conferred Caesar was slain. When he entered, the senate arose as if from respect. Cimber, a chief conspirator, approached as if to offer a petition, which Caesar seemed unwilling to receive. Cimber seized his robe and pulled it from his shoulders. At this, the signal agreed upon, the conspirators threw themselves upon Caesar in a body. He fell, pierced with twenty-three wounds, and expired at the foot of Pompey's statue.

While it cannot be denied that Caesar aimed to be an absolute Dictator of Rome, neither can it be denied that his plans and purposes were the broadest and wisest ever presented for the government of that domain. While he had destroyed the lives of perhaps a million men in battle abroad and many thousands in the civil wars at home, measured both as a soldier and a statesman, he has rarely been surpassed in all history.



KING VICTOR EMMANUEL
OF ITALY

CHAPTER III.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

A period of much confusion, lasting for some thirteen years, followed the death of Julius Caesar. His murderers had expected the Roman people to hail them as deliverers from a despot, but it did not prove so. Marcus Antonius made a speech over his body as it lay in the Forum, which aroused the wrath of the citizens against Caesar's enemies, terrified the Senate and made the army furious. Octavius, the grand-nephew and adopted son of Caesar, was in Greece when he heard of his uncle's fate, and as was proper for the heir to do, he shortly afterwards presented himself in Rome, and used a considerable part of his inherited wealth in securing partisans and increasing his own popularity. Antony, as consul, and because of his military connections, possessed almost absolute authority. But he wisely decided to unite his fortunes with Octavius, and they joined to themselves Lepidus, a wealthy man of but slight genius, thus constituting what is known as the second Roman Triumvirate.

Later, the friendly relations between Octavius and Antony were broken and Octavius was successful in defeating Antony at the battle of Mutina, in that part of Cisalpine Gaul which Antony was then trying to wrest from Decimus

Brutus. Because of this victory Octavius demanded from the senate that he receive a triumph and the consulship. To this Cicero demurred, as he really intended Brutus to have this honor. Whereupon Octavius took possession of the city and enforced his claims with the sword. Then the new coalition was made, and the western provinces were divided among themselves with the understanding that the eastern provinces should be similarly treated after Brutus and Cassius had been driven out.

It will be recalled how Cicero was put to death December 7, 43 B. C., many other senators, knights and citizens being proscribed and slain; how Cassius and Brutus, being defeated in two battles at Phillippi, each committed suicide, and how Cleopatra, having gained an ascendancy over Antony at Tarsus in Cilicia, took him away to Egypt with her. Meanwhile (41 B. C.), Octavius had defeated Antony's brother Lucius in a short war in Persia, and Lepidus, who had been expelled from the triumvirate. Antony having repudiated Octavia, his wife, and sister of Octavius at Athens, Octavius set sail with a fleet of nearly three hundred vessels and met and defeated the combined fleets of Antony and Cleopatra near the promontory of Actium, the Egyptian ships withdrawing from the battle at a critical juncture. This led to the suicide of Antony in the arms of his mistress, and to that of Cleopatra herself.

Egypt now became a Roman province, and Octavius, or Augustus—as he chose to have himself called—master of the world. Consul for the third time in 29 A. D., in command of all the Roman armies, "Prince of the Senate," he was made censor, while the office of tribune made his person inviolable, that of pro-consul gave him authority over all the provinces, and finally that of supreme pontiff, which came to him at the death of Lepidus, gave him complete authority

in matters of religion. Augustus has, by many historians, been regarded as a wise and successful statesman, and a chief reason for this view is the fact that he was not cruel by nature, strove to promote culture and the arts of peace, and administer justice. That he did strive to extend his domain by force of arms, is true, though, to avoid making his army a burden to the people, he reduced the number of his legions from fifty to twenty-five, thus maintaining a standing army of about one hundred and fifty thousand men.

One of the regrets of his life was the defeat of his legions under Varus in Germany, by the Teuton chief, Arminius, which event prevented the extension of the empire farther north and really led to its overthrow. This happened in the year 9 A. D., in the neighborhood of Detmold, the capital of Lippe-Detmold. A monument stands at Grotenburg, the highest point of the Teutoburger Wald, 1,200 feet above sea level, a colossal statue of Hermann, or Arminius, Chief of the Cherusci, commemorative of his victory over the Romans. For eight years the Gauls had struggled against the Roman armies, and their great chieftain, Vercingetorix, who had brought Caesar to the extremity of peril at Alesia, after gracing the latter's triumph in the streets of Rome, had been butchered in a dungeon. This Arminius knew and distrusted the plans of the Roman general, Tiberius, as well as those of his successor, Varus, and secretly resolved to thwart them. The policy of Augustus, if more pacific than that of his predecessors, was no less imperious. Besides completing the conquest of Spain, his generals had extended the Roman frontier to the Danube, and had brought into subjection all the territory south of that river now belonging to Austria, as well as East Switzerland, Lower Wertemberg, the Tyrol, Batavia and the Valtelline. To the list of great rivers controlled by the Romans, the Nile, the Tagus, the Seine, the

Rhone, the Danube and the Rhine, it was desired now to add the Elbe, when all Germany would become no more than a mere vassal to Roman authority. Arminius had, too, a personal reason for his hatred of Rome, as his wife had been taken from him by her father, and he himself accused of treason, while his brother Flavius could not be induced to leave the Roman service as a soldier. Arminius is given credit for the secret organization of armed men who were to strike when he gave the signal, and also for the revolt of the tribes near the Weser and the Ems, duly reported to Varus as requiring his immediate attention. This message came just after a succession of heavy rains, which made military movements very difficult.

Varus, with three legions—about 15,000 Roman infantry, some nine hundred cavalry, and an equal number of allied forces from the conquered territory—set his army in motion eastward in a line parallel with the course of the Lippe river. In the vast forests of what now constitutes the little principality of Lippe, the soil partly sodden with rain at the time, Arminius made his attack. All the auxiliary forces of Varus at once deserted him. According to the meager accounts derived chiefly from Tacitus, the horses were killed first. This was due somewhat to the fact that the cavalry general, Numonius Vala, attempted to escape with his squadrons. The riders as well as their steeds were all cut to pieces. Varus himself, after being wounded, committed suicide rather than fall into the enemies' hands. One lieutenant general surrendered, but according to report he and his men were sacrificed in a gorge in the mountain ridge, through which runs a road between Panderborn and Pymont. Here, according to tradition, stood one of the sacred groves. After the destruction of the army of Varus, the Roman garrisons throughout Germany were assailed and cut off, and in a few

weeks the German soil was freed from the Roman invader.

Arminius was assassinated in the thirty-seventh year of his age by some of his own kindred, but a peculiar sequence of his great victory was that Arminius came to be worshipped as a savior of mankind. In the language of Prof. Creasy: "As time passed on, the gratitude of ancient Germany to her great deliverer grew into adoration, and divine honors were paid for centuries to Arminius by every tribe of the Low Germanic division of the Teutonic races. The Irmin-sul, or the column of Hermann, near Eresbergh, the modern Stadtberg, was the chosen object of worship to the descendants of the Cherusci, the old Saxons, and in defense of which they fought most desperately against Charlemagne and his Christianized Franks." "Irmin, in the cloudy Olympus of Teutonic belief," says Palgrave, "appears as a king and a warrior, and the pillar, the 'Irmin-sul,' bearing the statue, and considered as the symbol of the deity, was the Palladium of the Saxon nation until the temple of Eresbergh was destroyed by Charlemagne, and the column itself transferred to the monastery of Corbey."

The reign of Augustus, though comparatively peaceful, was marked by the conquests of Drusus, of Cantabria, Rhætia, Vindelicia and Moesia. These conquests were completed by Drusus, son of Tiberius, under his father's reign, while the territorial gains of Germanicus (nephew of Tiberius) in Germany, which had been lost by Varus, were in part regained by the same after Tiberius came to the throne in 14 A. D. The reigns of the Julian emperors, so called from their relation to Julius Caesar, and which ended with the suicide of Nero in 68 A. D., were more marked by petty intrigues and cruelties than foreign conquests.

Of the four who succeeded Augustus, Tiberius was perhaps the ablest, though not deficient in the exercise of tyrann-

nical power. He established the system of espionage, and also brought together a body of praetorian cohorts, both measures with a view of protecting his own person. Sejanus, commander of these cohorts, taking advantage of the Emperor's confidence, caused the murder of Tiberius' son, Drusus, and committed other treacherous acts with a view to his own advancement, but his plans were discovered and he was strangled. Such a vigorous prosecution of those associated in the conspiracy and under suspicion followed, under the law of *Lex majestatis*, or lese-majesty, as to induce a reign of terror in Rome.

Caligula, selected by the senate to rule because he was the son of a successful general, Germanicus, well illustrates what an insane man may do when in power.

Claudius, brother of Germanicus and uncle of Caligula, who, with his generals, Aulus Plautius and Vespasian, made a partial conquest of Britain (43-45 A. D.), though a wiser ruler in some respects, was a victim of his freedmen and his wives. One of these freed slaves, Narcissus, caused the empress, Messalina, mother of Claudius' two children, to be put to death. Claudius then married his niece, Agrippina, daughter of Germanicus, who induced the emperor to adopt her son Nero, by a former marriage, as his successor. Whether she poisoned the legitimate heir, Britannicus, or whether this was done by Nero, is uncertain, but it is unquestioned that her imperious temper led Nero to have her stabbed to death. This was one of the first of Nero's crimes, and is said to have been inspired by Poppaea, "the most beautiful and wickedest woman in Rome." Then followed the murder of his first wife, Octavia; Poppaea, his second; Seneca, his former instructor; the poet Lucan, and thousands of Roman citizens. To his reign is credited the first persecution of the Christians, the burning of Rome, and the defeat of the Parthians

in Armenia by Corbulo. The last three Julian emperors all met violent deaths: Caligula was murdered by Chaereas, Claudius poisoned by Agrippina, and Nero, after planning to kill all his own generals and senators, in order to anticipate a decree of the senate, slew himself with his sword.

The power and arrogance of the army was now displayed in the fact that three emperors in succession, Galba, Otho and Vitellius (68-69 A. D.), were created by one factor or another of the military forces. The army in Spain proclaimed Galba, a man of seventy, of patrician birth and a fine record as a military man, but the legions of the Rhine were against him, and one of his former lieutenants, Otho, who had been the husband of the infamous Poppaea Sabina, caused Galba to be murdered through a revolt of the praetorian soldiers and secured the title of emperor himself. The armies of Germany having proclaimed another general, Vitellius, emperor, the clash of these forces, as they met to decide the question in north Italy, was favorable to Vitellius. This was the battle of Bedriacum, where Otho, seeing himself vanquished, committed suicide, his reign having lasted for but three months. Almost immediately the legions of the East revolted in favor of their commander, Vespasian, and on the same battlefield in northern Italy where Otho's army was overcome were the forces of Vitellius defeated. Thus the most famous glutton in all history, who spent on his table more than forty million dollars during his brief reign of eight months, and whose voracity would shortly have ruined the empire, was killed by the Roman people.

Vespasian, head of the Flavian family, proved himself an efficient ruler. He had but recently subdued the whole of Palestine, and after the suppression of a revolt in Gaul under Claudius Civillius, his son Titus completed the work of destroying Jerusalem. One million, one hundred thousand

persons are estimated to have perished miserably in the siege, and the remaining inhabitants were dispersed and scattered among all nations. Vespasian built the Colosseum, expelled from the senate those members conspicuous for their vices, reformed the tribunals, and, above all else, enforced military discipline. In his reign, Lycia, Rhodes, Thrace, Cilicia, Byzantium and Samos were conquered. During the reign of his son and successor, Titus, much was done by way of erecting places of amusement and giving spectacles to increase the happiness of the people.

The chief event of importance in the reign of Domitian (81-96) was the extension of the Roman power by Julius Agricola in Britain (86 A. D.), though, fearful lest his achievements might make him too popular, the cowardly Domitian ordered him home. Agricola's son-in-law, Tacitus, has left us a contrast between the virtues of the lieutenant and the vices of the emperor. The second persecution of Christians is recorded in the reign of Domitian.

The reigns of the "five good emperors," Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antonius Pius and Marcus Aurelius, though marking a period of general prosperity, were not devoid of strife and warfare. Nerva, a native of Crete, was chosen by the senate, and during the two years of his reign peace prevailed. He recalled exiles, freed many prisoners, and prohibited persecutions of the Christians. At his death he named his successor, Trajan, regarded as the most accomplished, with the possible exceptions of Julius Caesar and Augustus, of the Roman rulers. Trajan was Spanish by birth, and not averse to war. He reduced Dacia to a Roman province; also Armenia, Mesopotamia, Assyria and a part of Arabia. Under Trajan the Roman empire reached its greatest extent. The third persecution of Christians (107 A. D.) is said to have occurred under Trajan, and he was especially severe upon

the Jews of Cyrene who had murdered 200,000 of his subjects. Trajan constructed roads, improved the water supply, restored the harbors, built new baths, and made Rome a city of magnificent public buildings. His adopted son, Hadrian, who succeeded him (117), was averse to war for the purpose of foreign conquest as less essential than the maintenance of internal prosperity. He voluntarily abandoned the conquests of Trajan in the East, including the provinces of Assyria, Armenia and Mesopotamia, and only against the Jews, who revolted during his reign (135), did he display warlike severity. In being banished from Judea, it is said that 580,000 Jews were destroyed by the Roman soldiers. He erected a temple to Jupiter in the new Jerusalem which he built. A wall was also built during his reign from Newcastle to Carlisle in Britain, to head off the Caledonians. The career of Hadrian's adopted son and successor, Antoninus Pius (138-161 A. D.), is cited in history as a "reign without events," because so devoid of conquests, calamities and internal discord. However, the laws which were to be embodied in the constitutions of future nations were perfected by the maxims of Antoninus Pius and the jurists of his empire. During the reign of his adopted son and successor, Marcus Aurelius (161-180 A. D.), one of the wisest of the Roman rulers, the empire began to be threatened by conspiracies within and invasions from without. The emperor was made to believe that the Christians through their secret meetings were responsible for these internal troubles and so issued edicts against them. He also repelled the invasion of the Parthians and the Teutonic hordes of the West who began to press upon the borders of the empire. A war with Parthia was waged for three years, one with the Marcomanni, five years; also wars with the Quadi, the Goths and the Franks.

With the death of Marcus Aurelius at his post of duty in camp at Vienna, the turning point in the career of the empire had been reached. During the period of the Military Despotism, beginning with the reign of Commodus (180), to the accession of Diocletian (284) there was a gradual decline. The factors which had contributed to national growth through the conquest and control of foreign elements now began to give way before the agitation and encroachment of these and other elements from without. During these years (104 in number) the soldiers were the real rulers of Rome, and the events well illustrate what a pure military despotism is bound sooner or later to become—an exponent of mere force and brutality. Commodus purchased the peace of the Germans, and, a giant in strength, sought to amuse himself with cruelties and debaucheries; he was poisoned by a woman with whom he was enamored and whom in a fit of anger he had previously condemned to death. Pertinax, his successor, was elected by the army, and slain by the swords of the soldiers. Didius Julianus bought the throne at auction for a sum equal to \$15,000,000, and from a commercial point of view was not fairly treated, as he held the throne about two months, and was then condemned to death by the senate. Septimus Severus, though he reorganized and strengthened the army, removed the last vestige of authority from the senate. His reign is distinguished for the fifth persecution of the Christians, the death of 50,000 of his soldiers serving under his sons, Caracalla and Geta, in Britain, through plague, and the building of a wall across Britain from the Firth of Forth (209). Caracalla's reign is conspicuous for cruel proscriptions and murders, of which the foulest was that of Papinian, the greatest of Roman jurists, on account of the refusal of the latter to defend the emperor in his

crimes. Caracalla was killed by his successor, Macrinus, who was himself killed by the soldiers the following year. Elevated to the throne by the same soldiers, Heliogabalus, cousin to Caracalla and high priest of the sun in Syria, stands forth for effeminacy, debauchery, brutality and contempt of all forms of honor and decency, as the most infamous and repulsive of all the Roman despots. Despite his insane projects for committing suicide "in splendor," he was ignominiously slaughtered.

Alexander Severus (222-235 A. D.) affords a strong contrast to his predecessor, and in fact to a majority of the military despots in the praiseworthy character of his public acts as well as personal life. He had engraved on his palace walls: "Do unto others as you would have them do to you," and made this his rule of conduct. The distinguished jurists Ulpian and Paullus were his advisers. He successfully resisted the Persians who had established a new kingdom in Parthia, and was engaged in driving back the Germans when he met the usual fate—was assassinated by Maximin, who had a military following strong enough to make himself emperor. He was of gigantic size and strength, and rivals Vitellius in the accounts of his voracity. He is said to have consumed eight bottles of wine and forty pounds of meat every day. On assuming the diadem he put to death all his early associates who knew him as a common soldier, including his most intimate friends. The sixth persecution of Christians is credited to his reign. He met the usual fate—was assassinated by his troops near Aquileia (236 A. D.).

Of the next eleven emperors, Gordian I and Gordian II were put to death by Pupienus Maximus, who, with Balbinus, after brief reigns, shared the same fate. Gordian III routed the Persians, while his tribune, Aurelius, vanquished the

Franks at Mayence; then Gordian was put to death by Philip the Arab, to be himself killed and succeeded by Decius, who was slain by the Goths, 251 A. D. Gallus, an officer under Decius, having proclaimed himself emperor and concluded a disgraceful peace with the Goths, was duly murdered by his own soldiers, who acknowledged Aemilian as emperor, but soon served him in the same way. The next emperor, Valerian, was captured by Sapor I, King of Persia, and after languishing for three years in abject slavery, was put to death. His skin was then taken off, dyed a deep red and suspended in a temple to signify the disgrace of the Roman arms. The son and successor of Valerian, Gallienus, was a detestable creature intent upon selfish indulgences, who was killed by the soldiers and succeeded by Claudius II, 268 A. D.

This period has been called that of the "Thirty Tyrants," from the number of usurpers that appeared in all parts of the empire. Gibbon enumerates nineteen of these, including Odenatus and Zenobia, in Syria; Macrinus, in Egypt; Piso and Valens, in Greece; Areolus, in Rhetia; Posthumius, Victorinus and Tetricus, in Gaul. A plague decimated the realm at this time and at times carried off as many as 5,000 victims a day in the city of Rome. Claudius had some respect for his own character and possessed military genius. He destroyed an army of 300,000 Goths who had advanced into Macedonia, and also a fleet of 2,000 sail, but was fatally stricken with the plague and abdicated in favor of Aurelian. Already famous for his victory over the Franks, Aurelian reaped the fruits of the victories of Claudius, and by driving out the Vandals, Germans, and other barbarians who had penetrated into Italy, became the restorer of the empire. The walls he built to protect Rome still remain in part. He de-

feated Zenobia in two battles and destroyed Palmyra, recovered Gaul, Spain and Britain from the usurper Tetricus, and, following the policy of Augustus, made the Danube the northern frontier. His successors, Tacitus, Probus and Carus, followed the course of Aurelian in this respect. Carus being killed, as it was said, by lightning, one of his generals, Diocletian, took away the authority from his effeminate and cruel sons, Carinus and Numerianus, and established an absolute imperialistic form of government, which extended to the dissolution of the empire.

Though a military monarch, Diocletian created what was called a "Tetrarchy," or rule of four. He made Maximian, who controlled the West, including Italy and Africa, his associate emperor, Diocletian, with his residence at Nicomedia in Asia Minor, retaining control of the East, including Thrace, Macedonia, Asia and Egypt. Then he appointed an assistant for himself, Galerius, who controlled Noricum, Panonia and Moesia, and an assistant for Maximian, Constantius, who controlled Spain, Gaul and Britain.

The last of the persecutions of Christians is said to have begun (303 A. D.) under Diocletian and continued for ten years, when Constantine (313 A. D.) became sole ruler. The recognition of Christianity as the state religion, the calling of a council of the clergy at Nicaea to fix the points of faith (325), and the establishment of a new capital for the empire at Constantinople (328), were among the leading events of his reign. He also abolished the praetorian guards, giving territorial governors only civil authority, and made the army as well as the civil rulers entirely subject to the central power.

Constantine had begun to rule as successor to his father, Constantius Chlorus, over Spain, Gaul and Britain (306 A.

D.). There were then six hostile rulers in the empire. Both Maximian and Maximin committed suicide; Galerius died of a frightful disease; Maxentius was defeated by Constantine and drowned in the Tiber, and Licinius, who also attacked Constantine near Adrianople, was captured and subsequently executed.

Though Constantine had divided his dominions among his three sons, Constantius, Constans and Constantine, and two nephews, Julian and Gallus, the people were dissatisfied and murdered all the remaining nephews. Constantine II made war on his brother Constans, and was killed by him at Aquilea (340 A. D.), Constans being killed in Spain (350 A. D.) by Magnentius, an officer of Constans' army. Gallus was put to death by Constantius (354 A. D.). In the year 360, Constantius and Julian quarreled and the death of the former left Julian sole emperor. He endeavored to restore the pagan religion and gained the title of "the Apostate." He was a man of energy and repelled the Alemanni who crossed the Rhine, and made a vigorous war on the Persians, but his successor, Jovian, made a disadvantageous peace with them (363 A. D.). Valentinian was elected by the army emperor of the West, and he made his brother, Valeus, emperor in the East. During the reign of the latter, the Huns, emerging from the steppes of Asia, attacked the Goths and drove them into the Roman territory. They were given homes south of the Danube in Thrace and Moesia, but being maddened by the ill-treatment of the Roman officials, rose in revolt and defeated the Roman army at Adrianople (378 A. D.), where Valeus was killed.

Theodosius succeeded Valeus as emperor of the East (379 A. D.), and continued the policy of admitting the barbarians and protecting them. When Gothic soldiers were mobbed

in the city of Thessalonica, he caused 7,000 of the people to be gathered in the circus, where they were slaughtered in a body by the soldiers (390 A. D.). He made one notable military expedition to the West, after its ruler Valentinian II, who succeeded his brother Gratian, had been basely murdered by Arbogastes, general of his armies (392 A. D.). Theodosius forced a passage through the Alps, and defeated the army of Eugenius and Arbogastes at Aquileia, when the latter committed suicide. At the death of Theodosius, his son, Arcadius, became emperor of the East, and another son, Honorius, of the West.

Stilicho, a barbarian general in the Roman service, was the guardian of the young Honorius, emperor of the West, and as long as Stilicho lived, Italy was safe from invasion. Stilicho defeated the Goths under Alaric in the battle of Polentia (403 A. D.), and the Vandals, Burgundians, Suevi and Alani, under the leadership of Radagaisus in 406 A. D. But Honorius, it is said, became jealous of him, and he was put to death (408 A. D.).

Alaric invaded the Italian peninsula and Rome was made to pay an enormous ransom. When Honorius refused to grant him lands, Alaric gave the city up to his soldiers, who sacked it (410 A. D.). Valentinian being but six years old when proclaimed emperor, the government was controlled by his mother, Placidia, sister of Honorius and daughter of Theodosius. She had two able generals, Aetius and Boniface, the latter serving in Africa, and the former instrumental in defeating Attila, at Chalons (451 A. D.), where it is said the battlefield was strewn with 180,000 corpses.

Aetius, like Stilicho, was also murdered by his jealous prince, Valentinian III, who was himself assassinated in his palace. Shortly afterwards Genseric, chief of the Vandals, under the pretense of avenging the emperor, took possession

of Rome and for fourteen days gave the city up to pillage (455 A. D.). Rome was now tottering, for seventeen years (455-472) Ricimer, a Goth, commanding the foreign troops, exercised absolute authority, elevating and deposing emperors at will. Eight rulers perished or were deposed in twenty years. Odoacer, King of the Heruli, had little difficulty in overthrowing the youthful Augustulus, and the barbarians took full possession of Italy (476 A. D.).



PRESIDENT POINCARÉ
OF FRANCE

CHAPTER IV.

THE FRANCO-IBERIAN PENINSULA.

As we have seen, France, Spain and Portugal, which are included in the Franco-Iberian peninsula, were under the control of Rome until the fall of the Western Empire in 476. At that time Odoacer was entrusted by Zeno, emperor at Constantinople, in whom the full control of the whole Roman Empire had been vested by the senate, with the government of the West. The Roman senate had voted that one emperor was enough, and so Odoacer, chief of a Teutonic tribe, the Heruli, who had previously captured and sacked the city, was named as Patrician at Rome. The old form of government, with senate, consuls, etc., was continued, but from this time on, as the historian Freeman expresses it, "old Rome itself passed into the power of the barbarians."

The Iberians were probably an indigenous people whom the Celts in their migrations found in possession of this western territory. They were related to the Finns of the north. In France, under the name of Aquitani, they were crowded to the south of the Garonne, and, as Basques in Spain, they were forced to the northwest, the mixture of races being called Celtiberians.

Alaric, king of the West-Goths, as we have seen, though kept in check for a considerable time by the Roman general,

Stilicho, finally in 410, captured and sacked the city of Rome and, although he died before actually in control of a government in Spain, he is rated as its first sovereign (406). His successor, Athauf, went nominally as a Roman official to restore the Spanish province to the empire, but really made it an independent government modeled after that of Rome (411).

General history makes Clovis, chief of the Salian Franks of Tournai, the first king of France in 481 A. D. By his victory at Soissons in 485 he defeated the last remnant of the Roman army and extended his dominions south as far as the Loire. But kings were not then what they subsequently became, nor was France the France of Francis I, or even of Charlemagne.

Clovis drove the Alemanni, as the Germans are still called in the French language, out of France, and laid the foundation of what afterwards became the monarchy. Next he conquered the Burgundians and reduced them to vassalage. Then he beat the Visigoths and drove them into Spain and conquered the Aquitainians. He became a Christian and united the Frankish peoples by assassinating all the "kings" of these tribes. For these deeds of blood, so far from being blamed, he was regarded as a blessed instrument in the hands of Providence who merited the reward of empire in that he was a converted pagan and good Christian.

Long and bloody wars marked the reigns of his immediate successors, who were his four sons, each of whom became a separate and independent king. They annihilated the Burgundian kingdom and divided it among themselves. They did the same with Provence. They subjugated to their power the whole of Gaul except a corner in the southeast still held by the Visigoths. They invaded Italy and were driven back by the Lombards. They invaded Spain and met the same

fate. They were more successful in Germany, one of these kings, Theoderic, conquering the Thuringians and appropriating the territory which now comprises parts of Prussia, Saxony and the Saxon duchies.

To these wars of conquest succeeded the wars between the brother kings, more bloody than those for foreign dominion. On the death of Clotaire, the last surviving son of Clovis, the kingdom was again divided between four sons, with their respective capitals at Paris, Orleans, Rheims and Soissons. There were naturally mutual jealousies, disputes and wars over boundaries, which resulted in the terrible civil wars lasting from 561 to 613, and which were fanned into fury by the rivalries and the hatreds of Fredegunde and Brunhilda, two women, far famed in early French history, whose domestic treachery and secret assassinations added to the horrors of war.

The most powerful of the Merovingians was Dagobert, who was sole king from 628 to 638. Under him the Basques or Vascones, south of the Garonne, were conquered, the dukes of the Bretons submitted, the greater part of the Frisians and Saxons paid tribute and the Thuringians, Alemanni and Bavarians received his commands as king. The Frankish empire extended from the Weser to the Pyrenees and from the Western Ocean to the Bohemian frontiers.

When Dagobert died his two sons, Sigobert II and Clovis II, were still children, and the monarchical authority declined rapidly, while the power of the mayors of the palace increased, the more so as children were placed upon the throne in many cases.

In 680 an Austrasian army, under Duke Martin, set out to attack Ebroin, Mayor of Theoderic III, then King of Neustria and Burgundy. This army was defeated and Martin, drawn into a conference by Ebroin, was killed. But

Ebroin, the last defender of Merovingian royalty, was assassinated (687) by Duke Pippin of Austrasia, which act practically ended the Merovingian dynasty.

The "Mayor of the Palace," as we have seen, was the chief executive officer of the king and commanded the main body of the army, so that the mayor after a time came to possess more power than the king himself.

During the confusion and wars which accompanied the breakup of the decaying Merovingian dynasty, one of these mayors, Pippin of Heristal, an able prince and ruler, usurped the royal authority, in all but the name, and founded what became known as the Carolingian dynasty. An illegitimate son of Pippin, Charles Martel, succeeded him, and opened up a remarkable period.

Pippin's oldest son had died before him, and the second son was assassinated. Accordingly, Pippin had made an infant grandson mayor of Neustria and Austrasia, with the child's grandmother, Plectrudis, as guardian. Refusing to be governed by a woman and child, the Neustrians chose a mayor of their own, one Raginfred, who proceeded to invade Austrasia from the west, while the Saxons and Frisians attacked it from the east. The Austrasians needed an able commander, and so they took this illegitimate son of Pippin, Charles Martel, out of prison where Plectrudis had placed him, and made him king.

He was thirty years old and a rough barbarian soldier, knowing little of the management of armies. At first unsuccessful, he withdrew his forces into the interior of the Ardennes forest, and, watching his opportunity, he suddenly emerged, surprised and routed the Neustrian army. He defeated them at Cambroi the next year (717), and, the Aquitanians coming to their assistance, he routed their combined forces two years later at Soissons and reduced them to sub-

jection as he subsequently did to the Alemanni, the Bavarians and Thuringians. But his greatest victory was yet to follow. The Arabs, who had conquered Spain, crossed the Pyrenees and poured out over the southern plains of France. Charles met and defeated them in 732 at Tours, putting 300,000 Saracens to the sword, and fighting one of the decisive battles of the world, in that it saved Christian Europe from overthrow by the religion of the prophet. Some of Martel's fiercest wars and conquests were in Germany, whither he sent his Christian missionaries to prepare the way for his military expeditions. He developed into a wise and far-seeing prince, though much of his life as a king was passed in war. From 733 to 739 he was in arms against the Burgundians, who had refused to submit to the weak successors of Dagobert. Charles conquered them, as well as the valley of the Rhone, and subjected Septimania, where the remnant of the Arab army had fled from Tours. That same year, 739, he completed the subjugation of Provence. Although he divided the lands which he took from the church to reward his soldiers, he was engaged in preparing to cross the Alps to defend the Pope, who had solicited his aid as against the Lombards, when he died.

Charles supported and protected the English monk, Boniface, the apostle to the Germans, and by means of Boniface's labors Germany was brought into union with Rome, the result of which was the founding of the Holy Roman Empire, which endured up to the time of Luther.

One of the elder sons of Charles Martel, Pippins the Short, succeeded in 752. He was a son and protector of the church and knew how to bargain with it for his own advantage. Upon the promise of help from Pippin against the Lombards, Pope Zacharias approved of his usurpation of the royal name and authority and Pippin was anointed king by Boni-

face at Soissons in 752, his coronation being consecrated by Pope Suphen II in St. Denis in 754. In fulfillment of his agreement with Pope Zacharias while he lived, Pippin led his armies over the Alps and warred with the Lombards, whom he conquered and forced to cede to him the exarchate of Ravenna and the Pentapolis, which territory he gave to the Pope. This famous donation created the temporal power of the Pope which lasted more than a thousand years, when it disappeared in the founding of the Kingdom of Italy in 1870. Pippin carried on wars against the Saxons, later continued for so long and with such merciless severity by his successor.

Next came Charlemagne, the greatest figure in French history antecedent to Napoleon. It may be mentioned at the outset that the Carolingian dynasty, like all other dynasties of the early feudalism, was neither hereditary nor elective, but was determined by the will of the king, confirmed by the great feudatories.

The first wars of Charlemagne were in Italy, and he embarked for them on the Pope's appeal for help against Didier, the king of the Lombards. He crossed the Alps, took Verona and Pavia after long sieges, assumed the iron crown of the Lombard kings, and made a triumphal entry into Rome in 774. Upon a revolt of the Lombards two years later, Charlemagne returned and conquered the whole of Italy. This was in Italy and was but an episode. His greatest war and one which continued with varying fortunes for thirty years (from 772 to 804) was with the Saxons of northern Germany, bordering on the North Sea and the Baltic.

The vast empire of Charlemagne was surrounded by hostile and non-Christian nations, the Danes in Scandinavia, the Slavs of the Baltic, the Avars of Hungary, and the Arabs in Spain. The whole reign of this great prince was spent in

incessant wars. The most celebrated of these in song and story, perhaps, are his wars in Spain (from 778 to 812). A Saracen emir or prince, an enemy of the caliph of Cordova, offered to put Charlemagne in possession of the cities which the caliph held south of the Pyrenees. Accordingly, Charlemagne led his army through Gascony, compelling Duke Lupus to take an oath of allegiance and cross the Pyrenees. On his return, after reducing Pampeluna and Saragossa, his army was ambushed by the Basques in the valley of Roncesvallis and among those killed was the Count Rowland, commander of the Marchess of Brittany. Six other successful expeditions beyond the Pyrenees were made by the Franks, conducted chiefly by the sons of Charlemagne, and the empire was extended nearly to the Ebro. Not under the first Napoleon was the French empire so widely extended in every direction, and the Germans, just creeping into civilization, were taught history, grammar, writing and arithmetic by the English Alcuin, Charlemagne's chancellor. In the year 800, the western Roman empire was revived and Charlemagne crowned as emperor by the Pope, but with this difference: it was no longer the "Roman Empire," but the "Holy Roman Empire," to signify that the ultimate dominion was vested in the church. This was an event of utmost importance, and shaped the history of the middle ages.

Imperialism and centralization, represented by Charlemagne, were antagonistic to feudalism and the interests of the great feudatories, and, finally, the latter prevailed. The vast empire, held in unity by the wisdom and power of the great Charlemagne, went to pieces at his death.

Twenty-nine years after his death, in 814, the empire had been divided into three kingdoms; forty years later, one of these kingdoms had split into seven, and a century after Charlemagne's death, France was a batch of practically in-

dependent states, just as Germany was at the peace of Westphalia in 1648, and as Germany continued to be for two centuries and a half after that date.

Charlemagne in his lifetime made his three sons sovereigns—Pippin, king of the Italians; Charles, of the Germans, and Louis the Pious, of the Aquitanians. The former two dying before their father, this division was annulled, and Charlemagne made Bernard, son of Pippin, King of Italy, while Louis the Pious, as emperor, retained the rest of the dominion. Rebellion against him by his three sons and domestic wars followed, which were continued after the death of Louis until finally settled by the battle of Fontanatum (841) and a partition of the empire between the three sons in the famous treaty of Verdun, 843. Some historians have gone so far as to say that all subsequent treaties on the continent have been mere modifications of this early compact. This treaty first created the distinction between France and Germany, with the middle Kingdom of Lorraine between them, the latter becoming picking grounds for both, and of which only the name of the province now remains. Wars, and nothing but wars, followed this division between the kings and rebellious and rival feudatories. Charles the Bald, King of France from 843 to 877, spent his life, sword in hand, fighting the Northmen, who, under Rollo, took possession of Northern France and later of England.

These much-dreaded pirates, in their two-sailed vessels, each fleet under the command of a *viking*, despite the storms which often shattered their craft, laughed at the winds and waves, and it was said that in the clash of battle, at the sight of blood, they were seized with a "berserker" (bare-shirted) madness which doubled their strength and rendered them immune to blows, as though led on by Thor, the god of battles.

Under the famous pirates, Hasting and Rollo, these Norse-

men besieged Paris for a year (885 to 886), and after the arrival of Charles the Fat, with his army of reinforcements, who ruled Charlemagne's whole domains, the Parisians were infused with the purpose of destroying these robbers. But the cowardly emperor had made a disgraceful treaty permitting the Norse to go and ravage the province of Burgundy. The next year Charles was deposed, and the ruins of his empire served to form seven kingdoms: France, Cisjurane Burgundy, Transjurane Burgundy, Navarre, Lorraine, Italy and Germany.

The Capetian dynasty, beginning with Hugh Capet, in 987, was marked by the weakening of the royal power and the increase of power in the great feudatories, a process which served as the cause of the development of many different wars at different places, some, indeed, at the same time, to gratify the greed, ambition or other passion of the rival feudal barons. These barons built their castles in strong places and the peasants flocked to their precincts for protection; this they were given in consideration of labor in time of peace and service in the army in time of war.

From this period of the feudal regime, during the last half of the tenth century, the first general war occurred between France and Germany.

Louis III of Germany invaded France in 858, but was compelled to retire; Lorraine was annexed to France in 868; Charles the Fat, who usurped the throne of France in 884, was deposed in 887. After Charles, Count Eudes, who had defended Paris against the Northmen, was selected king. Charles the Simple having been elected king by the partisans of the Carolingian dynasty, Eudes frightened him out of Rheims, and he fled to Arnulf, Emperor of Germany, for refuge, which would have occasioned a war had the counts and bishops of Lotharingia supported the emperor, and had

not Eudes died in 898, when Charles the Simple succeeded him without opposition. Then followed the establishment of the Norse in Normandy, ceded to them by Charles, and the death of the latter in prison in spite of Germany's efforts to save him in 929.

This was succeeded by the election of his son, Louis IV (d'outre-Mer), recalled from England at the age of fifteen, his imprisonment for a year, the purchase of his release by the cession of his last city, Laon, to Hugh, Duke of France, for his support, and his accidental death while hunting in 954. The reigns of Lothair and his son, Louis V, which ended in 987 by his accidental fall from a horse, are notable, aside from the wars of the vassals for territory, on account of the extreme poverty to which these last descendants of Charlemagne were reduced.

The financial and political weakness of the last of the Carolingians was the chief reason for which Hugh Capet, having at his disposal the revenues of three of the richest abbeys of France, decided to assume the title of king. He and his three lineal successors were closely allied with the church, and the military events of the time include the persecution of the Jews (1010), the conquest of Burgundy (1016), the first burning of heretics (1022), the invasion of Brittany by Robert the Devil (1033), the battle of Val des Dunes, near Caen, fought by William the Bastard against his vassals (1046), the defeat and death of Eudes II, Count of Blois, in the Barrois (1037), the bloody victory of the Normans over the French of the Ilse-de-France (1054), the frightful famine of the eleventh century, the conquest of Portugal by Henry of Burgundy (1095), the first Crusade undertaken almost alone by the French (1096), the quarrel of the three Popes and the Concordat of Worms (1122), and the contest for the divine right of title between Edward III of England

and Philip VI of Valois, inaugurating the "Hundred Years' War" between France and England, lasting from 1338 to 1453.

The great problem of the middle ages was whether there should be one universal empire over all the nations of Europe, and, if so, whether the Pope or the Emperor should head it. In this was involved the secondary problem whether monarchy or feudalism should prevail. We see here the foundation head of the long and bitter wars and the intricate complications which devastated Europe and of which France had her full share.

After the ruin of the house of Burgundy by the French monarchy, the French king, in his greediness, claimed everything. In despair, Mary, the heiress of Burgundy, threw herself into the arms of Maximilian of Austria, and the Low Countries fell under the dominion of the Hapsburgs. Here was another fruitful source of war, not only in France, but also in Spain.

With the fall of Charles the Bold of Burgundy, and the success of the policies and intrigues of the "Universal Spider," Louis XI, the French monarchy proper was constituted and the force of feudalism was exhausted. From this time forward, wars in France began to take national aims and interest into consideration, and wars for mere private and personal interests abated in the same proportion.

The wars of the French in Italy began in the last decade of the fifteenth century, when Ferdinand II of Aragon wrested the kingdom of Naples from France, and continued until the defeat of Francis I at Pavia and the treaty of Madrid in 1526. It was with Francis I that the king became an absolute monarch in France and so continued until the French Revolution of 1789.

Contemporary with these events was the beginning of the

Reformation in Germany, which was the source of the Thirty Years' War inaugurated by the House of Austria, a struggle both political and religious, beginning in Bohemia in 1618, and involving in its purpose the subjugation of Europe by the ruin of German Protestantism, and of the religious wars in the Low Countries, in all of which France took part. But what concerned France more nearly were the religious wars at home, which raged until the edict of Nantes and broke out with new fury after that edict was revoked. The best remembered event of these wars is the "Massacre of St. Bartholomew." These wars were most bloody and vindictive, and treachery and private assassinations played important parts.

The divine right of kings was a doctrine which Bossuet founded upon doctrine drawn from the Holy Scriptures, a doctrine which all the world believed and Louis XIV embodied in his famous declaration, "I am the State."

The long and costly wars of Louis XIV, upheld and supported by this doctrine and faith, imposed a debt on France which could not be met by the ordinary means of raising revenues. The States-General were called to provide the necessary means, and in 1789 the French Assembly adopted the declaration of the "Rights of Man," and on June 20, 1790, abolished hereditary nobility and titles of honor. The changes and horrors of the revolution, which began with the storming of the Bastille, July 14, 1789, followed rapidly. Louis XVI had to pay the penalty of the misgovernment of the many sovereigns who had reigned before him, more especially of his grandfather, Louis XV, and his predecessor, Louis XIV, who was styled *Dieu Donne* (God-given), but from the ills he inflicted upon the French people in his efforts to conquer all Europe, seems to have been quite the re-

verse. With the Reign of Terror, one party after another arose to power and put its enemies to death. Yet amidst these commotions it prepared a uniform code for all France, decreed a system of national instruction, and by the sale of the "national property" and consolidation of the public debt, opened up unproductive domains and established public confidence in the credit of the state. The king of Prussia and the Emperor Leopold, by the famous declaration of Pilnitz, signed August 27, 1791, had expressed their intention of re-establishing Louis XVI in his rights, and thus, through a coalition of kings against France, began a frightful war of twenty-three years' duration.

Bloody battles ensued, including that of Menin, Belgium, June 20, 1792, in which the Austrians were defeated; the battle of Valmy, France, September 20, in which Kellerman, with 96,000 undisciplined troops, repulsed 160,000 Germans; Custine's capture of Speyer, Worms and Mainz (all recaptured by the allies in August, '93); Montesquieu's conquest of Savoy, and Auselme's capture of Nice; and Dumouriez's victory at Jemmappes, Belgium, November 6, over the Austrians.

Meanwhile, the massacre of the Swiss guards and the storming of the Tuileries, with the imprisonment of the royal family, occurred in Paris, August 10; the massacre in the Abbaye prison, September 3; and of the Royalist prisoners, September 5.

Later that year the French Republic was established; Savoy, Nice, and Belgium, annexed to France; Louis XVI, beheaded; and war declared by France against England, Spain, and Holland (Feb. 1, 1793).

With Robespierre practically dictator, in March, '93, the "Reign of Terror" was soon under way. The assassination

of Marat by Charlotte Corday followed, and the execution of the Queen, of the Duke of Orleans, and of Madame Roland as well. The execution of Robespierre, St. Just, and seventy of their colleagues in July following, terminated the "Terror."

Battles occurred meanwhile at Lincelles, Quesnay, Dunkirk, and Watignies, France, favorable to the enemies of France. Houchard gained a victory over the English (Sept. 8) at Hondshoote, and defeated the Dutch five days later; but his army was seized with a panic and fled in disorder to Lille, which event led to the execution of both Houchard and Custine. Kleber practically settled the rebellion in La Vendee by routing the peasant army at Chollet (Oct. 17). The campaigns of '94 and '95 passed, and before the end of the last, Barras, appointed by the convention, selected a young lieutenant, Napoleon Bonaparte, who had distinguished himself at Toulon, to defend the Tuileries against an attack of the Royalists.

This marked the beginning of the greatest military career known to the world—a career unlike that of Alexander, Caesar, and other great conquerors, in the fact that it was a protest against the rule of royalty by divine right, in favor of republican-democracy; and this, although the personality concerned, by reason of its ability and the conditions encountered, was almost absolute in its authority.

In October, 1795, the mission of the Convention was ended. With five honest directors, only one of whom was competent, and with an empty treasury, the Republic of France began its work. It had no commerce or industries, no local government was in operation, and food was scarce. But it had some experienced soldiers and generals. The army of the Rhine was commanded by Moreau; that of the Sambre and Meuse, by Jourdan; Hoche commanded in the West, and



NAPOLÉON BONAPARTE

Napoleon had just received command of the army of the Interior, which was soon exchanged for that of the army of Italy.

He was coldly received by generals Massena, Augereau, and the others when he reached the army of the Alps; but his plans, which Carnot had authorized, won them over. The armies of Jourdan and Moreau of about 75,000 each, separated by mountains, were to converge and meet on the road to Vienna, while Napoleon would advance toward the same point from Italy.

He had 38,000 men, when he turned the Col de Montenotte, with which to take the offensive against the Austrian general Beaulieu, with 60,000 Sardinian and Austrian troops. He pierced their center, crushed the Sardinian army, made terms which gave France Savoy, Nice, and Tenda, and then, crossing the Po behind the Austrians at Piacenza, carried the bridge at Lodi, repulsed the Austrians, and levied war contributions on the Dukes of Parma and Modena and on the Pope at Rome. By February 2, 1797, the French, 55,000 strong, had fought twelve pitched battles, besides some sixty skirmishes, and achieved victories over 200,000 Austrians, more than 20,000 being killed and wounded and 80,000 taken prisoners.

Passing the brilliant but in some respects unfortunate campaigns of Napoleon in Egypt (1798-99), it may be said that as the military power of France grew stronger the political seemed to weaken. Disorder was prevalent everywhere in civil life and the Directory itself came to be regarded as dishonest.

The government had need of a strong hand. In the words of Sieyès: "To save France a head and a sword are needed"; and it was at this juncture that Bonaparte landed

at Frejus from his Egyptian campaigns. Elected First Consul, he found that the royalty of Europe did not desire to recognize France as a Republic, but desired the restoration of the Bourbon line of princes which the nation regarded as having betrayed its real interests. A letter to this effect came to Count Talleyrand, Napoleon's Minister for Foreign Affairs, from Lord Grenville, English Minister, and its publication united Frenchmen of all parties as supporters of Napoleon. And if the kings of Europe would not consider this young Corsican and his government seriously, what better course could he pursue than to teach them that one of humble origin might be quite able to surpass them all in administrative ability as well as war!

Napoleon evinced his sentiment toward royalty by installing himself in the grand palace of the Tuileries and crushing a royalist insurrection. He freed the country of robbers and appeased revolutionary disturbances. Trade revived and signs of prosperity began to appear. But the dignified and able letters which he had written to the European sovereigns, making overtures for peace, were laughed at and rejected.

War was unavoidable, and Napoleon arranged his plans to make it glorious and decisive for the victors. Giving Moreau command of the armies of the Rhine and Switzerland, and Massena the army of Italy, he took the field himself and guided an army of 40,000 men over the St. Bernard Pass into Italy, cutting Melas off from Austria. Melas, forced to give battle, made his first attack near Marengo—and won, at first. His second attack was so successful that he sent word of his victory to the cabinets of Europe. But Napoleon was hard to convince, and Desaix, who came up with 6,000 fresh troops, was ordered to charge the front

of the Austrian column, while the remainder of the French fell upon the flanks of the enemy. Desaix was killed, but the Austrians were thrown into confusion which turned into a rout, and Marengo was won (June 14, 1800). Then the Archduke John was defeated (Dec. 8, 1800) by Moreau at Hohenlinden, on the Isar, with a loss of 20,000 men and eighty-seven pieces of cannon. These, with many minor victories, led to the Peace of Luneville (Feb., 1800).

But, with this feeling among the crowned heads of Europe, there would have been no rest for Bonaparte had he been possessed of less ambition. There followed renewed hostilities with England; the loss of Egypt; the Peace of Amiens (March, 1802); his election as First Consul for life; rupture of the Amiens' compact; then Napoleon King of Italy and Emperor of France; the defeat of the fleet by Nelson; the wonderful victories of Napoleon at Austerlitz (Dec. 2, 1805), Jena and Auerstadt (Oct., 1806), Eylau and Friedland (1807); and the Peace of Tilsit (July 8, 1807).

The first serious reverse sustained by Napoleon was in Spain, when the French troops were repulsed at Saragossa and Valencia, and Dupont was surrounded and forced to capitulate (July 20, 1808). Junot was defeated later by Wellesley and by September the Allies possessed all Spain. Yet Napoleon crossed the mountains, broke the enemy's center, and entered Madrid, where he suppressed the Inquisition, closed two-thirds of the convents, and put an end to feudal rights and internal custom-houses. Saint Cyr was meanwhile carrying on a successful campaign on his left wing in Catalonia and Soult, driving 30,000 English before him on the right wing, finally compelling them to take refuge on ship-board at Coruna.

The Archduke Charles of Austria, in April, 1809, with 175,000 men attempted to gain possession of Bavaria, garrisoned by scattering French forces, thinking it a good time to avenge Austria's disasters while Napoleon was occupied in the Iberian peninsula. Warned two days in advance, Napoleon, with the forces of his two marshals, Massena and Davout, cut the Grand Duke's army in two at Abensberg (April 20), captured Landshut the next day, and on the 22d, turned their flank at Eckmühl, driving them back upon the Danube and capturing nearly their entire force. In five days he had taken 60,000 men, 100 cannon, cut the Austrians in two, forced one-half into Bohemia and the other on the Inn, and opened a clear way to Vienna. The bloody battle of Aspern, or Essling (May 21, 22, 1809), followed and the victory of Wagram (July 6) cost Austria, in the treaty which followed, signed at Vienna (Oct. 14), a territory with 3,400,000 inhabitants—mostly in Illyria.

For five years longer fortune was in the ascendancy with this remarkable man, who not only mastered France but came near to mastering all Europe, but who was overthrown June 13, 1815, at Waterloo. However, he settled the question of the "divine right of kings" for all time to come, in the negative.

Since then France has been engaged in war in North Africa, took part in the Crimean war and in the struggle of Italy against Austria. The fatal mistake of France from a military point of view, perhaps the most fatal in her whole history, was in allowing Prussia to overpower Austria in 1866, to annex independent German States and form the North German Confederation, with the king of Prussia at the head and Prussia dominating. This was not foreseen then, but it is easily perceived now.

SPAIN.

If Spain does not present a history of such continuous and imposing wars as France in the first thousand years of her history, she amply makes up for it during the period of her supremacy from the time of the union of Aragon and Castile and the expulsion of the Moors in 1492, down to the fall of the Spanish power.

Spain, as we have seen, was a Roman province before Caesar conquered the whole of Gaul. In the break up of the Roman empire in the beginning of the fifth century, A. D. 409, hordes of Teuton barbarians, Alans, Vandals, and the Suevi crossed the Pyrenees and poured into the peninsula. About 414, one of the Teutonic tribes, the Visigoths, invaded the country and established the monarchy of Goths at Catalonia, under King Athaulf. The Gothic Kingdom lasted until 770 when Roderic, the last of the kings, was killed in battle with the Saracens at Jerez, allowing the invaders possession of nearly the whole of Spain. The remnants of the Goths took refuge in the mountains of Asturias, Burgas, and Biscay, where they maintained their independence and remained quiet. The history of the revolutions and civil wars of the invaders among themselves, which reached its climax in the rivalry between the Omniads and the Abbassides, need not be entered into in detail.

The Gothic Kingdom of Asturias was founded by Pelayo in the eighth century, with the help of the remnant driven to the mountains, and began under his successors to extend itself southward by slow degrees, keeping in the meantime all acquisitions, and to reconquer territory from the Arabs. In the ninth century the communes of Leon and Navarre came into existence as states. Leon was long vexed with

civil wars between the scions of the royal line, and both would have fallen, or rather never have arisen, but for the wars among the invaders themselves. Castile branched out from Leon and became an independent state, and was erected into a kingdom in 1033. In their progress Southward the Goths, whom we may now call the Spaniards, conquered the territory of Aragon from their enemies, the Moors—now so-called; and, by the incorporation in it of Catalonia, the kingdom of Aragon was founded in 1035. The kingdom of Portugal was founded last—the Count of Lorraine becoming king—and is one of the original states which still remains.

The Omniads ruled in Spain for about 275 years. Under Abd-er-Rahman III, who became caliph in 929, Cordova, his capital, was the most splendid city in Europe except Constantinople. It was very far in advance of all the rest of Europe in science, art, literature, agriculture, industry and commerce. Its schools excelled beyond comparison those of Christian Europe, and Greek philosophy was studied and taught there before it was known in Christendom. The Moorish fleets controlled the Mediterranean and carried on an extensive trade along all its borders.

With the fall of the Ommiad dynasty in 1031, the Moorish dominion disintegrated into a number of independent states—Cordova, Seville, Toledo, Lisbon, Saragossa, Valencia, Torlosa, Munia, Badajoz and others of lesser note. Aragon and Castile, taking advantage of this division, subdued and incorporated some of these States and subjected others to tribute, but not without long and fierce conflicts. The Spaniards, pushing their conquest over the Moors, called in for aid the Almoravides from Morocco, who, after defeating the Christians and reconquering much lost territory, after severe fighting, turned their arms against the

Moors and conquered them. The power of Yusuf's Almoravides or "Al-Morabith" (men devoted to God)—a mixture of monks, warriors, and thieves—was broken by the Almohades, another set from Morocco, who in turn became the rulers. In a decisive battle in the plains of Las Navas de Tolosa, 1212, the kings of Castile, Navarre, and Aragon by their united strength destroyed the Almohade power in Spain. For seventy years they had sway over Almoravides and Arabs from the East, until all Europe became alarmed and united against them. All that remained of it capitulated to Ferdinand and Isabella in 1492. This ended the Moorish wars in Spain and marks the beginning of a new era. The great captain, Gonsalvo, triumphed over France in Italy. In 1512 Ferdinand made himself master of Navarre, except of that part lying north of the Pyrenees, and effected the unification of Spain under a single monarchy. In 1516, Charles I, grandson of Ferdinand and Isabella, became king of Spain, and in 1519 became Holy Roman emperor as Charles V. Descended from Maximilian of Austria and Mary of Burgundy, he was the first of the Hapsburgs to ascend the throne of Spain. His reign saw a series of wars with the French, the Turks and the Protestant states of Germany. To him succeeded Philip II, famed for his wars, his cruel persecutions in the Netherlands, and his great Armada which fought against and was defeated by England (1588).

During the reign of Charles V, Spain was the first military power in Europe, and its vast American possessions made it by far the richest in wealth and the widest in dominions. Under the bigoted Catholic Philip II, Spain began its career of decline and has descended lower and lower until it has lost all its foreign possessions and sunk to the level of the lowest of the second-class states. But it is now

throwing off the fatal incubus which paralyzed it and there is good hope of the resurrection of a new Spain. In the Seven Years' War, Spain joined with France. As a result of this war, Spain ceded Florida to Great Britain and Spain acquired Louisiana from France. In 1779 Spain became the ally of France in the war against England; in 1783 she recovered Florida, and in 1819 ceded it to the United States.

In the Napoleonic wars the unconquerable endurance of the Spanish and English soldiery first proved that Napoleon was not invincible. Meanwhile, Spain's American colonies had revolted and, after fierce wars of sixteen years, in 1826 Spain had lost all her colonies on the mainland, Cuba being the last to be surrendered; now Spain had not a foothold on the American continent of which at one time she possessed the greater part.

After the downfall of Napoleon, the bloody tyrant, Ferdinand III, came to the throne and abrogated the liberal constitution of 1812. He restored the religious orders to their former predominance, abolished the Cortes and re-established the Inquisition. Besides other reactionary measures, he put to death under arbitrary forms of law over 7,000 Spanish patriots.

In 1820, a liberal revolution headed by Raphael del Riego restored the Cortes and other institutions which had been destroyed by Ferdinand in 1814. In 1823, the Holy Alliance took note of the revolution and France was commissioned to suppress it and restore Absolutism and the rule of the church. A French army of 100,000 men invaded Spain, and the Spanish forces were not able to resist them successfully. The French entered Madrid, drove out the liberal government and restored Ferdinand, who had been declared of unsound mind by the Cortes. The prime minister, Ber-

nandes, finally adopted a somewhat more liberal policy, thus offending the absolutists and the clericals who rallied around Don Carlos, the brother of Ferdinand and the representative of extreme absolutism and the church party. Meanwhile, in 1831, Ferdinand, having no male heir, decreed the revival of the old law admitting female succession, and declared his daughter, Isabella, his successor. The king died in 1833 and Queen Maria Christina, became regent for her daughter, Isabella II. Civil war broke out between the Carlists and the Christinas (so called from the Queen regent, Christina). The Carlists were at first successful, but were finally defeated and Don Carlos went into exile, leaving his pretensions to his son.

After the death of King Ferdinand VII Spain was a prey to internal dissension, strife, confusion, and war; owing to the conflict between the liberal and the reactionary or absolutist and church parties. In 1843 Isabella became of age and assumed the crown. But this did not end the turmoil. In 1851 a concordat was made with the Pope by which all religions other than the Roman Catholic were suppressed. In 1852 the Queen's advisors attempted to put a measure of absolutism into the constitution which had been adopted. These reactionary moves and measures led to a new outbreak in 1854. There were republican and Carlist risings and war over the whole peninsula, followed by a war with Morocco in 1859-60.

Finally, in 1869, a liberal monarchical constitution was put through by a combination of republicans under Castelar and the progressivists under Prim. Several foreign princes were invited to take the crown, and Prussia was pushing Leopold, the Hohenzollern, whose candidacy gave rise to the Franco-Prussian war. The Duke of Aosta, Amadeus, son of King Victor Emmanuel, was finally chosen as king in

December, 1870, but abdicated in February, 1873. The end of his reign was distracted by a great rising, headed by the young Don Carlos. Upon the abdication of King Amadeus, a republic was established with Figueras as First President of the Ministry and Castelar Minister of Foreign Affairs. But confusion and war still prevailed, the Carlist insurrections in the North continued, and there were risings in different cities. In September, 1873, Castelar was made president of the executive with dictatorial powers. In 1874 Castelar was obliged to withdraw, and Serrano became nominally President of the Executive, though in reality a military dictator. Meanwhile, the war against the Carlists was still raging.

In December, 1874, Serrano proclaimed Alfonso XII, son of Isabella, King, and the army declared for him. Alfonso assumed the government in January, 1875, being seventeen years of age. In 1876 the Carlist revolt was finally and completely suppressed.

In November, 1885, Alfonso died, and his widow, Christina, became regent. In the following May a posthumous son was born who became king as Alfonso XIII. The Cuban revolt led to complications resulting in war between Spain and the United States in 1898.

PORTUGAL.

The province of Lusitania, under the Roman Empire, contained most of that territory now belonging to Portugal, the original inhabitants of which were composed of native Iberians and Celts from the north and east. The earliest colonists were Greeks, their towns being located at the mouths of the Minho, the Donroa, and the Tagus. The word "Lisbon" is derived from the Greek word Olisipo.

War and bloodshed may almost be said to have been the

regular order in this part of the Iberian peninsula between native tribes, and later, between Christian and Moslem, for more than a thousand years.

In 1004, Yusuf, the Almoravide emperor, then eighty-seven years of age, became the acknowledged sovereign of Mus-sulman Spain, and ruled it in comparative peace for thirteen years, dying at the age of one hundred. During this peaceful interval, Alfonso, King of Leon, Balicia, and Castile, which he had regained by the aid of that celebrated warrior, Ruy Diaz de Vivar, better known as the Cid, gave his natural daughter, Theresa, in marriage to Count Henry of Burgundy, who received with his bride a considerable territory in connection with the city of Oporto, and the title of the Count of Portugal (1095). In this way the name Portugal first appeared in history.

One of the first acts of Yusuf's son, Aly, was to proclaim a Holy War against the Christian states. He ravaged New Castile and carried his devastating work to the walls of Toledo. Alfonso's son, Don Sancho, a boy of ten, supported by seven experienced warriors, went against him. The armies met near Ucles, in the "Battle of the Seven Counts," where Aly was victorious and the young prince killed. This stirred the old King Alfonso to avenge his son's death, and he defeated Aly, driving him back into Andalusia with great loss. Under succeeding reigns a national spirit developed. Alfonso I took Lisbon from the Moors in 1147, and made it his capital. His son, Sancho I, gained the title of "The Founder."

Alfonso II and his son and successor, Sancho II, coming into conflict with the Papacy, were both excommunicated. The reigns of Alfonso III and Dennis (1279-1325) were comparatively peaceful and the country progressive. Alfonso IV had to defend his kingdom against both Moslem and

Castilian; Ferdinand, son of the next king, Peter the Severe, was the last of the legitimate line.

The reign of Peter's illegitimate son, John (1385-1433), is one of the most noteworthy in Portugal's history, made so largely by the discoveries and explorations of his son, Prince Henry the Navigator. A campaign against Morocco in 1415 resulted in the capture of Ceuta and the acquisition of nearly one-half of that country, which was held until 1578.

In the reign of Alfonso V occurred the Castilian succession disputes (1474-76), in which that monarch was defeated at Toro. In John II's reign Pope Alexander VI issued his famous bull of demarcation, dividing the new world between Portugal and Spain, and which gave to the former the territory of Brazil. During the reign of the next monarch, Emmanuel, Vasco de Gama doubled the Cape of Good Hope (1497-8), and in 1510 Albuquerque captured Goa, on the Malabar coast of India, which has remained a Portuguese colony since. Under John III Portugal reached its highest pinnacle of power as a nation, its decline beginning with the expulsion of the Jews and the attempts of King Sebastian (1557-78) to make new conquests. The latter was defeated and slain by the Moors at Alcazar Quevir in 1578.

Bitter disputes followed the death of the next king, Cardinal Henry, resulting in civil war and the conquest of the kingdom by the Duke of Alva, and its annexation to Spain under Philip II. A successful conspiracy in 1640, accomplished by John, Duke of Braganza, re-established the kingdom under John IV, the war with Spain terminating in 1668 by the Treaty of Lisbon.

During the reign of Joseph, son of John V, the minister

Pombal made a war upon the nobles and clergy and expelled the Jesuits from the country in 1759.

In November, 1807, Crown Prince John, acting as Regent, owing to the mental condition of Queen Mary Frances Isabella, was unable to withstand the efforts of Napoleon to divide Portugal, and so left the country and established himself in Brazil. Later, the country being freed by the successes of Wellington in the Spanish campaigns, the Crown Prince took the throne as John VI, though he continued to reside in Brazil till 1820. In that year, leaving his son Dom Pedro as Regent in Brazil, he returned to Portugal and with British assistance put down the revolt in that country and restored order.

Dom Pedro, who succeeded to the crown of Portugal in 1826, on the death of his father, resigned in favor of his seven-year-old daughter, Maria de Gloria, who, when of age, was to marry her uncle Miguel. The latter was made Regent in 1827 and attempted to restore the ancient form of government, but was opposed by Dom Pedro, whose fleet, under Sir Charles Napier, defeated the fleet of Miguel off Cape Vincent in July, 1833. In this struggle Dom Pedro was assisted by the Quadruple Alliance of England, France, Spain, and Portugal.

Queen Maria was fifteen years old when she took the reins, and it was said that neither ruler nor people knew how to conduct a government. A military revolt in September, 1826, compelled the Queen to restore the Constitution of 1822 representing popular sovereignty, and the Septemberists further liberalized the Constitution.

Another revolt restored the Chartists to power in 1842, and Costa Cabral as Minister controlled the country for ten years, when the Regenerators came into power, and through the Duke of Saldanha direct suffrage was established. In

1846, Saldanha's forces defeated those of Count Bonfim at the Torres Vedras. Later Saldanha was exiled, but restored by another revolution in 1851 and made Prime Minister.

An uprising of republicans occurred at Oporto in January, 1891. Supporters of Dom Pedro from Brazil attempted to get possession of the barracks and proclaim a republic. They were driven back by the royal troops, one hundred being killed and five hundred taken prisoners.

In 1910 an armed rebellion effected the overthrow of the monarchy and drove King Manuel into exile, when the National Assembly adopted a Constitution and established a Republic which has since been recognized by the Powers.



KING GEORGE V
OF ENGLAND

CHAPTER V.

THE BRITISH ISLES.

The countries now known as Denmark, Norway and Sweden possessed a warlike population given over to sea-roving long before England as a nation was fully organized. The Norse settlers of these peninsulas were a Teutonic people, with speech akin to the Low-Dutch, who had gradually driven out the Turanian inhabitants, the Finns and the Laps, and occupied these sea-girt lands. Little influenced by the Romans, these Scandinavians developed a peculiarly striking civilization, which sent them as conquering sea-rovers over the coasts of Europe and even across the Atlantic.

A century before Egbert united the Saxon Heptarchy (827), Gormo began his reign over Denmark; and two years before Egbert's ascension to the English throne Regnard Lobrock (825) began his reign in Sweden. These Norsemen were naturally no more warlike, perhaps, than the Angles, Saxons, or Jutes who had landed in Britain and either killed or made slaves of the inhabitants, a remnant fleeing to the western part now called Wales, inasmuch as all these tribes came from Denmark and the adjacent coasts and were known as pirates celebrated for burning, plundering, kidnapping and murder. A Jute was a native of Jutland, or north Denmark; and Saxon was the name

of the knife which each one carried and with which he fought and slew those who resisted.

In these early periods war was a common occupation. The fear of invasion tended to unity, and times of peace allowed tribal and personal ambition to keep the country in a condition of incipient civil war.

The invasions of Britain by Julius Caesar (55 and 54 B. C.) were practically two mid-summer incursion incidents of his campaigns into northern Gaul in those years. To cover the cost of these expeditions he took back with him large number of captives from Britain and the mainland, who were sold as slaves in the markets of southern Europe, and especially at Rome.

No doubt many returned with greater military and civil knowledge and they used it in later invasions of the Latin forces. In the third invasion, in which Claudius himself took part, Caractacus, leader of the Britons, was captured by Ostorius Scapula and sent in chains to Rome.

The only unity that the people of Britain had was in their religion of Druidism. The priests with their treasures were driven westward in the later invasion (43 A. D.) to the Island of Mona. As the Roman generals and legions came upon them the prayers of peaceful priests and the imprecations of horrified women could avail nothing in repelling or resisting the short swords of the Romans; and there took place a most horrible massacre, from which the peaceful, arborial worship of the Druids never recovered. There the cruelty of a high civilization exceeded that of the barbarian. While this was going on a revolt broke out in the East. Queen Boadicea, stripped of her property under the semblance of law, herself bound and scourged as a slave, her daughters ravished, appealed to her kinsmen and gathered them to the battle, and then occurred a tragedy indeed quite

equal to any of the many tragedies of the fight of might against right, or war against civilization. The British queen defeated the Romans and burned London (61 A. D.), but was soon defeated by Suetonius. The fruits of the victory were afterwards perpetuated in the city of York. There Constantine, surrounded by the victorious sixth legion, was proclaimed Emperor (315 A. D.). The cup of vengeance was now full, however, and running over; the greed and cruelty of degenerate civilization was to hear another defiance akin to the ancient cry of the Roman Senators, "Carthage must fall." From the forests of Germany, from Gaul, from the Iberian coasts west and south, from the Huns in the east, from the very Alpine Mountains came the cry of the oppressed: "Rome must fall, Rome must fall," and fall she did; and the weight of foreign military domination was lifted from the British land.

The northern part of England was conquered by the Danes in 867, and Danish kings and earls reigned at York. They invaded Wessex, but were driven from that section by Alfred in the year 878. However, he found it necessary to make a treaty with the Danish king, Guthrum, and he permitted Guthrum to hold the eastern part of England in the capacity of a vassal. To prevent further destruction of the churches and monasteries, a wantonness the Danes had previously taken much delight in, Alfred also required Guthrum to become a Christian. The immediate followers of King Alfred were forced to do much fighting with the Danes, but finally they were enabled to bring all the Teutonic people, including Danes, Dutch and English, into one realm. It was King Edward the Elder who first received the homage of all Britain in 924, but it was a considerable time afterwards before the Danes were all subdued. Under Edgar, who reigned from 959 to 975, Saxon England was at the height of its

power, but under his son, Ethelred, the invasions of the Norsemen and Danes began again. In 994 England was attacked by both Olaf, King of Sweden, and Sweyn, King of the Danes. They were only restrained from the destruction of London by a dastardly submission and promise of tribute by the timid Ethelred, who fled to Normandy. The English nobles made a tender of the crown to the Danish monarch. Sweyn's death permitted the return of Ethelred, but the rule of the latter was opposed by Sweyn's son, Canute. Ethelred shut himself up in London, where he died, leaving the name of king only to Edmund, who, in turn, was murdered November 30, 1016. So the Danish rule began over England. It was but a repetition of the same contest between Saxon and Dane. Canute having inherited the crown of his native country, Denmark, ruled over Norway and a part of Sweden as well, and now he became king over all England. He was thus the ruler of all northern Europe and the most powerful prince of his time. Scandinavian princes ruled in Normandy and in Russia, too. The strife went on in England till it culminated in the death of Harold at Hastings in 1066. One result amid all this confusion, militant and political, was that a language and literature were assuming shape with a vocabulary larger than that of any other people of Europe, a language so strong that it now dominates the continents of America, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

In William the Conqueror's raid into the north, with the wanton destruction of villages, towns and cities, and the slaughter of men and horrible suffering of women and children, the last remnant of the Saxons were driven north of the Tyne, and left there as a buffer between William and the ever-restless Celt.

The period from the term of William of Normandy to the

accession of Henry VIII, from 1066 to 1509, some 450 years of strife, was given to wars largely over the question of the retention of Normandy and the extension of English territory in France. Finally the claims to the whole of France and its throne solidified the opposition and unified the French into driving the English off the continent of Europe back upon their island, never again to rule over or govern an acre of the continent, with the solitary exception of the Rock of Gibraltar. Two years after the accession of William (1068) revolts broke out in the northern counties, whither the Saxons had been driven by the Normans. Added to this, continued landing of foraging parties of Vikings, harassed the coast from the Tweed to the Humber in the north. William, roused to terrible anger, swore by the "splendor of God" that he would lay waste the land, and waste it he did by burning a strip of a hundred miles wide from Northumbria on the east to Cumberland on the west; only those who fled to Scotland escaped. In the villages the poor freemen were forced to follow a conquering army, many of them glad to sell themselves into slavery again for lack of food to eat. Not satisfied with this, he turned southwest to Chester, the "Pride of Wales," and laid it low as a warning to the Welsh, and so thorough was his work that no Viking landed on that shore. There was nothing left to steal, burn or kill, and twenty years later surveyors passed it by as a worthless desert.

The Conqueror was succeeded by his second son, William Rufus. During the greater part of his reign of 13 years he was at war with his barons, and won a decisive victory at Rochester Castle, Kent. His sudden death gave the chance to his brother Henry, who succeeded him in 1100 A. D. He immediately issued a "Charter of Liberties," the first written guarantee from king to people, small, indeed, in itself, but

mighty in its consequences, the precursor of the "Magna Charta" and the foundation of a constitution for free people.

Henry's brother Robert landed in England and demanded the crown. The Ultra Norman barons supported him. But Henry bought him off with money, and Robert left England. Then Henry turned his attention to those who had aided Robert, especially known as "Robert the Devil." The Earl of Shrewsbury banished him from the country, forcing him to take refuge in Normandy with Robert. Henry declared war and defeated Robert at Tinchebrai, and held Normandy as completely as his father had held England. This victory and conquest coincide with the landing of the first English expeditionary force on the continent of Europe. Henry I did much for England and nationalism. He adjusted the courts of law, making them more equitable and free. He well deserves the title of the "Lion of Justice."

Stephen succeeded Henry I in 1135 A. D. Four years after his accession he was confronted with the usual troubles. Matilda, the daughter of Henry, landed in England and claimed the crown. Scotland and the west of England supported her, but the east held to Stephen. They met at North Allerton, in Yorkshire (1138), in the battle of the Standard. The Scots were driven home by the Saxon bowmen, and England was for fifteen years like a veritable place of hell, where robbery, torture and murder were every-day occurrences. Neither church nor state had force enough to check it, and the Norman's house went down in a black pall of despair.

The death of Stephen broke the line of strictly Norman kings as Henry II's accession marks the beginning of the Plantagenets—1154 to 1399 A. D. Henry's unfortunate quarrels with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who op-

posed the taxation of the clergy and the unfortunate and shocking murder of the latter, placed him in an equivocal position before the people, some thinking he was a monster who had deliberately murdered the saint of God, others thinking he was the one on whom to hang a centralized government sufficiently strong to control present conditions. Poor Henry was neither one nor the other; he was only trying to do the best he could. Henry, with the help of the common people, made the Barons recognize the fact that they were not the whole nation. With Henry we meet the realization that noble and peasant could live together in mutual respect. Henry took possession of Ireland in 1072. He died in 1189 A. D., and was succeeded by his second son, Richard I, who was king for ten years, followed by John, who reigned for seventeen years. These two, so different in character, exemplify the leading characteristics of the English people—the stay-at-home and the adventurer. Richard raised large sums from the Jews by selling charters to cities and towns—titles and offices were equally for sale—and away he went on the third crusade, spending the money with a reckless prodigality, enduring all the hardships of defeat and prison, as well as the intoxication of occasional victory. On his way home he was held prisoner by the Emperor of Germany for an enormous ransom, which taxed the people as cruelly as a continental war would have done, but he was able to check his brother John in his plots and schemes to take possession of the throne. By his courage and exploits he made England proud of him, and it may be said that he fairly earned the title of "Lion-Hearted." John, who was defeated by the French at the Battle of Bouvian, was a despicable creature, but the people compelled him to be better than he wanted to be; they forced him to sign the Great Charter, he afterwards taking a mean, contempti-

ble revenge by burning houses and committing robbery. At last, after being nearly drowned in the "Wash," he died miserably in an abbey nearby.

During Henry III's long and turbulent reign (1215-1272), Louis of France was defeated at Lincoln, and Simon De Montfort at Evesham.

He issued a charter granting all that had been previously given, and enlarged the liberties of the freemen. He rectified the coinage, and subdued the Barons by the simple process of burning and destroying their fortified castles. Through his wife he claimed the county of Toulouse and to enforce his claim had to declare war. His Barons refused to enter into the foreign service, but were glad to contribute a personal tax, known afterwards as shield money or "Scutage." With this money he organized an army made up of Saxons, Danes and some Welsh, this for the first time in English history. The King had an army independent of the Barons, and the common people had some share in the affairs of the country.

To effect a settlement of his Normandy possessions, he visited the continent in November, 1259, and while there a rebellion broke out in the east of England, headed by Bigod, the Earl of Norfolk, and the Bishop of Durham. Henry immediately left France with his army of trained veterans, an army all his own, and moved north to give battle. The duke and the bishop, convinced of the hopelessness of their cause, submitted at once and so forever ended the opposition of the Barons and the Church to the crown. After many judicial reforms, which were of permanent value, he died and was succeeded by his second son, Edward I.

Edward I, a king among men, has been acknowledged by all historians as having possessed a strong character, but seldom has its value been fully appreciated. To the student of

history he is the pivot of the coming United Kingdoms. In the midst of almost impossible conditions he conceived the idea of a united country. Think of the conditions: Wales, with a desperate people who never touched civilization unless to destroy, or to satisfy a wrong done; Scotland, the venom of the vanquished Saxons, combined with the irrepressible Celt, who for a thousand years had contended with Norsemen, Roman, Saxon, Norman, and Ireland, the land of continuous fighting among its own princes, where for many years past tribal contentions had resulted in little more than anarchy, were all brought into reasonable order. Edward, seven years before his father's death, was called on to take the management of the affairs of England into his own hands.

Under the leadership of Sir Simon De Montfort, the barons practically took all the powers of the king from him and vested them in the hands of three committees of Parliament, a committee from the Commons, Lords and Royal Council. The Commons got the balance of power, holding it to this day.

De Montfort's position of absolute power excited jealous barons, and they readily joined Prince Edward, in order to overcome him, which they did at Evesham in "Worcestershire." De Montfort died on the field, and Prince Edward took his place, though his father was nominally the king. When his father died, in 1272, Prince Edward was fighting in the East with crusaders in the third crusade. Much has been made of the religious side of the crusades, and not enough of the ethical, for primarily their whole effort was to check the advance of the Moslem and the Huns into Europe, and this being achieved, the crusades ceased, and the Turks retained possession of Jerusalem.

Edward first subdued Wales and cajoled the inhabitants into continued adherence by giving them his infant son as the first Prince of Wales. He then turned to Scotland, overran it and garrisoned it with English troops, and put a puppet king on the throne in the person of John Baliol. He went home satisfied that he had accomplished his object, but he did not know the temper of the Scots. They gathered around Wallace and drove the English out, and would have made Wallace king had not the latter refused the title. This excited the jealousy of the aristocrats. Wallace was betrayed by Monteath to Edward, taken to London and executed as a traitor, his head being placed on London Bridge on a pike. Officials sent the four quarters of his body to Scotland to intimidate the latter, but it only unified them to take an ample revenge, which they did at Bannockburn in the next reign, 1314, under the leadership of Robert Bruce. Edward died in 1307, having sown the seed of a united kingdom and founded a great empire.

The reign of Edward II may be passed over very briefly. As he was always weak, the Commons gained more and more in power, until he was foully murdered by his unfaithful wife and her paramour, Roger Mortimer.

Edward III succeeded his father in 1327, at the age of 14. In the year 1338 Edward III began what is now known as the One Hundred Years' War. He boldly claimed the throne of France as the nephew of Charles IV of France; this was given out as the reason for war, but the real cause was his desire to retain possession of the French lands still held by the English kings. For eight years on land and sea the English and French fought each other without any definite results, until Edward landed an army in France and invaded Normandy. Cannon were used for the first time, not indeed to hurl shots into the ranks of the enemy, but for the pur-

pose of frightening their horses. The great victory was not won by cannon nor by steel-clad knights, but by the sturdy bowmen, the common soldiers of England. Such was the battle of Crecy (1346), the first great victory on the continent for England. Then followed the siege of Calais, which continued for almost a year before the town was starved into submission and forced to surrender (1347). After some years of peace, war again broke out. In 1356 Edward again invaded Northern France and ravaged it. The next year his son, the Black Prince, gained the great victory of Poitiers. With only 10,000 men he found himself nearly surrounded by a French army of 60,000, but by skillful strategy and the steady hail of arrows he defeated the French. For three years longer the war went on until peace was made at Bretingy in 1360, by which France retained Normandy, and the English held Calais and the land south of the Loire. The French also paid an enormous ransom in gold for King John, a sum which England badly needed at the time.

The deposition and murder of Richard II occurred in 1399, and the reign of Henry IV may be described as abounding in semi-insurrections, culminating in the Battle of Shrewsbury, in the year 1403, which checked the revolutionary spirit to some extent.

Henry V succeeded in 1413, in troublous times, to the throne of his father. In 1415 he resumed the war with France, more to distract the people's attention from domestic affairs than for any other reason. He besieged Harfleur and took it; but his army had suffered so much from sickness that after leaving a garrison in the place he moved north toward Calais, intending to rest and reinforce his army. On the way he was met at Agincourt by a French army of 50,000, and fought against it with only 8,000 men. The

ground was too soft to support iron-clad horses and mail-clad knights, and many went down before they reached the foe. To go down that day was to die. Those that reached the English bowmen expected to meet defenseless men and cut them down, but on the contrary were received on the point of stout stakes driven into the ground, the points of which stopped the enemy's horses and caused great confusion. The battle axe and the heavy pointed mace did the rest, and the victory of Agincourt (1415) was won. From the pointed sticks of Agincourt evolved the modern bayonet, which, with butt on ground and point before, was to turn a charge of cavalry.

Henry VI was proclaimed King of England and France when in his cradle, and crowned first at Westminster and then at Paris. But Charles resisted. The Duke of Bedford, as regent for Henry VI, took command of the English forces in France. For more than five years they fought, till France north of the Loire was largely won. Bedford, victorious at Crevant and Verneuil, determined to reduce Orleans. With cannon to batter down the defenses, victory seemed certain, and if Orleans was occupied, opposition would be overcome. It looked very dark for France. But Joan of Arc, a girl of eighteen, entered the lists. She inspired her countrymen with fresh courage, and led them from victory to victory. The English feared her and thought she was a witch. But she converted the weakness of France into strength, and the English began to show signs of weakness. Deserted at last by the king she served, she fell into the hands of the English. Her body was burned at Rouen in the year 1431. The flames that burned her warmed her countrymen to enthusiasm, and England lost all its French lands; so the Hundred Years' War came to an end. It was begun by Edward III (1338) and finished by Henry VI in 1453.

Before Henry VI had reached his thirtieth year, England had lost all her possessions on the continent for which the Hundred Years' War had been fought with France, except Calais. Henry VI had married Margaret of Anjou, and the English people, angered by the loss of the French provinces and jealous of this French queen, had an especial hatred for the Duke of Suffolk who had negotiated the treaty with France, and was regarded as one of the murderers of the Duke of Gloucester, friend of the people. Suffolk was impeached and banished but murdered on the boat going to Calais. Another illustration of the popular discontent at this time was the insurrection, headed by Jack Cade, a native of Ireland, who for his misdeeds had been exiled to France. Assuming the name of Mortimer, with a force of 20,000 men, he attempted to capture London and seize the government, but after a few days of riot was captured and killed (1450).

The "Wars of the Roses" between the rival houses of Lancaster (Red Rose), and York (White Rose), which continued for thirty years, in which twelve pitched battles were fought, eighty princes of the royal blood killed and the nobility almost exterminated, began with the battle of St. Albans, May 23, 1455, where the Yorkists gained a complete victory. Similar results followed at Bloreheath, Staffordshire (1459), and at Northampton (1460). King Henry was taken prisoner and Queen Margaret fled with the young Prince Edward to Scotland. Richard, who was in the strict line of descent, now demanded the crown, but Queen Margaret raised an army and at the battle of Wakefield (1460) Richard was slain.

The battle of Bosworth Field (1485) put an end to the contest, the lives of more Englishmen having been lost in a

single battle than in the course of the wars with France for forty years previous.

The Earl of Richmond, Henry Tudor, was thirty years of age when he was crowned on the field of Bosworth as Henry VII, the crown having been recovered from a thorn bush. Various insurrections soon required his attention, one under Lord Lovel, 1486, pretender to the House of York; Lambert Simnel, whose followers were defeated at Stoke-upon-Trent, June 16, 1487, and Perkin Warbeck, finally beheaded in the Tower, November 28, 1498. Henry was also entangled in an alliance for defending the Duchy of Brittany against Charles VIII of France. In 1509 Henry VIII succeeded to the throne, and joined the League of Cambrai which Pope Julius II, with Maximilian of Germany and Louis XII of France, had formed against Venice the previous year. In 1511, however, Julius decided that the French should also be expelled from Italy and, without scruple as to his former alliance, formed the Holy League, in which Maximilian, the republic of Venice, Ferdinand of Spain, the Swiss, and King Henry of England, all joined for the nominal purpose of preserving the Church, but actually to drive the French out of Italian territory. The only ally of France was James IV of Scotland. The Battle of the Spurs was fought August 16, 1513, at Lis, between the English and French cavalry, where the French were routed. During Henry's absence on the continent, the Scotch invaded the north of England and were met and defeated by the Earl of Surrey at the battle of Flodden, where James IV was slain. The Scotch had crossed the Tweed with an army of 50,000 men, while the earl had but 26,000 when he encountered the enemy at the foot of the Cheviots, September 9, 1513.

Peace was made the next year with both Scotland and

France, and May 31, 1520, at the invitation of the French king, Henry sailed to Calais to meet Francis I of France and Charles V of Germany on "The Field of the Cloth of Gold." Henry acted as a sort of arbiter between the other two monarchs. English diplomats may be said to have held the balance of power ever since between France and Germany. Through all the centuries of continental warfare it has survived to the present outbreak. Passing Henry's domestic and papal quarrels, and the executions instituted by himself and his daughter, Queen Mary, what was regarded as a national disgrace to England occurred in the last year of her reign, when the Duke of Guise, January 7, 1558, surprised and captured Calais.

After the battle of Hastings, the Scandinavians made no further encroachments upon the British possessions. Christianity became established in Sweden in the middle of the twelfth century, and later on in Finland. Norway being united to Sweden, the latter increased in power and extent under its warrior rulers. All the Slavic lands on the south and east coasts of the Baltic, including Lauenburg, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, the coast of Courland, and Livonia—from Holstein to Esthonia—were united under Waldemar II., 1202-1241. The kingdom of the latter fell to pieces, Waldemar being captured—while out hunting—by Henry of Schewin; and Hamburg and Lubeck became free cities, while the German provinces returned to that government. By the Union of Calmar, 1397, the three Scandinavian provinces were united under Margareta of Denmark. Gustavus Vasa led a revolt against the tyranny of the Danish, broke the Union of Calmar, expelled the Danes, and he was crowned King of Sweden in 1544.

Elizabeth's long reign from 1558 to 1603, though filled with intrigue, executions, expeditions and explorations, was

comparatively free from martial warfare. Two exceptions may be noted, the most prominent among which is the attack and destruction of the Spanish "Invincible Armada" in 1588. According to Motley the Armada included ten squadrons, or more than 130 ships, carrying upwards of 3,000 cannon. It was intended to carry twenty thousand soldiers and to receive on its way 30,000 more from the Spanish army in the Netherlands. The causes for this attempt on the part of Philip II of Spain are not hard to find: First, the refusal of Elizabeth to marry him; second, the surrender to him by Mary of Scotland of her claims to the throne, and lastly the influence of Rome. England was not yet Protestant, neither was she Catholic, but the domination of Spain would make her Catholic. Spain had the money and also the greatest navy in the world. When the navy was assembled at Cadiz, Sir Francis Drake entered the port and sunk more than a hundred of the Spanish ships. This delayed the movement for a year. Indeed, when the ships came it took stout hearts to go out and meet them, but Howard, Drake, Hawkins, Raleigh, and a host of other brave captains, were ready. They captured several of the enemy's vessels, and one was blown up. The Spaniards made for Calais to repair damages and take a fresh start, but Drake followed them, threatening them with fire-ships, and forced them to make sail north, closely pursued by the English, who had not yet lost a single ship. The storm was so furious that all along the coast of Scotland and the north and west of Ireland the sea was strewn with the wreck of the Spanish boats.

The other prominent military movement of Elizabeth's reign was the rebellion which broke out in Ireland in 1595. The condition of that island had continued to be deplorable from the time of its partial conquest by Henry II. The

chiefs of the native tribes were constantly fighting among themselves, while the attempts of the English to force the Protestant religion upon them was bitterly resisted; while as a climax the greed and misgovernment of the rulers kept the people in a condition of misery. A war of extermination began under Elizabeth became so relentless that the Queen herself said if the work of destruction continued "she should have nothing left but ashes and corpses to rule over." The barren victory gained by England has carried its own curse ever since.

What was called "The Thirty Years' War" extended from 1618 to 1648. Inaugurated by the House of Austria for the purpose of subjugating Europe through the ruin of German Protestantism, it will be sufficient here to refer to the part that England took in it. The intense belief in the Divine Right of Kings on the part of James I, his contemptuous refusal to hear and grant the petitions of the Puritans, his blind adhesion to the Episcopacy, in which he fancied his own preservation was involved, and the anti-Catholic laws, drove English Catholics to Virginia, and the Puritans to Massachusetts. Within ten years it is said that more than twenty thousand left England for the land of the free. James' adherence to the conception of the Divine Right of Kings was sharpening the axe for the neck of his son Charles, and in principle opposed the powers of a democratic House of Commons.

To understand the execution of Charles, one must first bear in mind the actions of James I of England and James VI of Scotland. The former had become King of England by a fortuitous combination of circumstances. His relations with his mother were never normal. The awful murder scene in Holyrood Palace, while he was yet unborn, the seeds of bitterness sown there, the strife of nobles seeking

place, the religious hatred and the awakening of the people, all the panorama of the Thirty Years played in the person of James. But the part that England took in the war itself was small, and consisted largely in the sending of volunteers and soldiers of fortune, mostly Scotch Presbyterians and English Puritans who fought in the Netherlands and under the incompetent Duke of Buckingham at Rochelle.

Though James made a feeble effort to assist the Protestant party in the 'Thirty Years' War, his truckling attitude toward Spain and the fines he imposed upon Catholics so angered the Commons that the Gunpowder Plot to blow up Parliament House when the King opened the session, was entered into by a Catholic gentleman, Robert Catesby, and Guy Fawkes, a Yorkshireman. The discovery and execution of the plotters resulted in the employment of greater severity toward both Puritans and Catholics on the part of the King.

Under Charles I began the great Civil War between King and Parliament, involving partly religious and partly political questions. The struggle commenced in 1642 with the battle of Edgehill, Warwickshire, in which the Roundheads were defeated by the King's Cavaliers. Cromwell's army of "Ironsides" proved of better fighting quality, however, and gained victories at Manton Moor, 1644, and Naseby, 1645, and also in the second war of 1648, which proved decisive.

Charles II broke faith with the Dutch, seized New Amsterdam, and thus brought on a war with Holland. At the same time efforts of English merchants to get the exclusive possession of foreign trade involved England into a war with France. In 1667 a Dutch fleet sailed up the Thames. It was said to have been manned largely by English sailors

who had not received their pay. They made their own terms of peace. In the secret treaty which Louis XIV made with Charles at Dover (1670) Charles deliberately sold himself to the French monarch for £300,000, with which to carry out his scheme to destroy the political liberty and Protestant faith of Holland. This new war with the Dutch caused a financial panic in England and ruined great numbers of people. The Rye-House Plot, which had for its object the murder of the King and also his brother James, resulted in the execution of prominent Englishmen, some of whom were unquestionably innocent. The Rebellion of the Duke of Monmouth, ending with the battle of Sedgemoor, in Somersetshire (1685), the Bloody Assizes conducted by Judge Jeffreys, and the King's quarrel with the Bishops, were among the most sanguinary events of the reign of James II. His abdication and flight mark the vanishing of religious and political persecution, as a reaction on the part of the English people, just as the administration of Charles II had resulted in the abolition of feudal dues and the establishment of the Habeas Corpus Act.

The Revolution of 1688, which established a large measure of personal liberty and the liberty of the press, was still an incentive to strife. In 1689 James II landed in Ireland, established his headquarters at Dublin, and issued his Act of Attainder summoning all who were in rebellion against his authority to appear for trial on a certain day or be declared traitors, subject to be hung, drawn and quartered, and to have their property confiscated. Londonderry was besieged and the inhabitants brought to a state of starvation. Finally they were relieved by an expedition from the river. The battle of the Boyne the next year (1690), where James was thoroughly defeated, settled the question in Ireland; while the massacre in the vale of Glencoe, Scotland, though

never settled as it should have been by the punishment of the assassins, practically ended the war. The Peace of Ryswick, a village of Holland, where the treaty was signed between William and Louis XIV, making the Princess Anne successor to the English throne, ended the conspiracy between Louis and the Stuarts to change the religion of England and brought the continental wars to a close (1697).

Louis XIV, who had only been prevented by the earnest efforts of William from annexing the Netherlands to France, desired also that his grandson, Philip of Anjou, on the death of the feeble Charles II, should become King of Spain. This purpose of Louis to annex a kingdom was an important influence inducing him to sign the Treaty of Ryswick. William had tried to prevent Louis' design on Spain by the conclusion of two secret treaties, and also of a Triple Alliance made by England, Holland, and Germany, as against France. Louis XIV had signed these treaties, but, it appeared, without the slightest intention of observing them. When the king of Spain died, in 1700, besides sending his grandson, Philip of Anjou, to Madrid to occupy the throne, Louis placed French garrisons in the border towns of the Spanish Netherlands, and avowed it his purpose to make the son of the exiled monarch, James II, sovereign of England, Scotland and Ireland. Accordingly began the War of the Spanish Succession, which really constituted a second Hundred Years' War between England and France.

Spain had neither money nor troops with which to assist Louis, and the latter had no allies except the Elector of Bavaria and the Dukes of Modena and Savoy. Arrayed against him was the Grand Alliance entered into in September, 1701, including England, the Netherlands, Austria, the German Empire, and a little later Portugal. Austria was supposedly most interested as possessing the rightful claim-

ant for the Spanish throne; but each power had its private interests to protect. England's purposes were: 1—The protection of its government at home. 2—The maintenance of a Protestant power in Holland. 3—The retention of its possessions on the American continent. John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, commanded the English and Dutch forces, and Prince Eugene of Savoy was leader of the German forces. Both were superior generals. Voltaire said of Marlborough that "he never besieged a fortress which he did not take, nor fought a battle which he did not win." He was pronounced "avaricious, unscrupulous, and perfidious"; but, as Napoleon said, "The worse the man the better the soldier," and perhaps those qualities enhanced his success.

Marlborough captured the forts in the Spanish Netherlands which Louis XIV had garrisoned in order to menace Holland, and carried the war into Bavaria. On the 19th of August, 1704, was fought the battle of Blenheim, which the French call Hochstet and the Germans Plentheim. The allies had about 5,000 killed and 8,000 wounded, the greater part of the loss occurring in the army of Prince Eugene. The French army was almost annihilated. Out of 60,000 men, not more than 20,000 ever reassembled. Some 12,000 were killed, 14,000 taken prisoners, and the capture included all the cannon, colors, tents and equipages, the general, Talarard, commanding the French, and 1,200 officers of rank. In less than a month Bavaria was subjugated. Gibraltar was captured the same year by the English and has remained in their possession ever since. Ulm, Landau, Treves, and Traerbach surrendered to the allies before the close of the year, and the Hungarians laid down their arms. In 1705 the Archduke Charles, with a small English army, landed in Spain and captured Barcelona. Aragon and the neighboring provinces submitted to him and the next year he entered

Madrid. Marlborough penetrated to the heart of Brabant and found the French under Villeroi at Ramillies. The defeat which the latter suffered here (May, 1706), cost France 5,000 killed and wounded and 15,000 prisoners. In 1707 the English army was defeated in Spain at the battle of Almanza; but the next year Marlborough and Eugene joined their forces in Flanders, making an army of 80,000 men. Although the French under the Duke of Burgundy and Vendome numbered 100,000, they were put to rout at Oudenarde (July, 1708), with a loss of more than 10,000 soldiers. Ghent, Bruges, and Lille capitulated. The next year a battle at Malplaquet, near Mons (September, 1709), constituted a partial victory for the French, inasmuch as they lost but 8,000 men disabled, while the allies lost 21,000. A victory over the Germans in Spain (December, 1710) saved the crown to Philip V. The defeat of Eugene at Denain, France, (July, 1712), with the loss of seventeen battalions, practically ended the war.

Three treaties followed: that of Utrecht (April 11, 1713), between France, Spain, England, the Netherlands, Savoy, and Portugal; that of Rastadt (March 7, 1714), between France and the Emperor; and the Treaty of Baden (June 7, 1714) between France and the Empire. As a result Louis XIV was compelled to acknowledge Protestant succession in England, to renounce the union of France and Spain—though Philip was allowed to retain his crown, and England held her possessions of Newfoundland, Acadia, and the territory of the Hudson Bay Company.

The military events in the reigns of the first two Georges included the quelling of the insurrection and battle of Sheriffmuir, in Perthshire, Scotland (1715); the War of Jenkins' Ear (1739), directed against restrictions on trade; the War of the Austrian Succession, in which George II

led his own troops at the battle of Dettingen, Bavaria; also the battle of Fontenoy, in the Netherlands, in which the French were victorious; and the Seven Years' War in Europe and America (1756-1763).

England espoused the claim of Maria Theresa to be the legitimate heir to the house of Austria, and opposed the efforts of Frederick the Great of Prussia, Louis XV of France and Philip V of Spain, to place Charles, the Elector of Bavaria, who had assumed the title of Duke of Austria, on the throne of Austria with the title of Charles VII. Holland was also on the side of Maria Theresa. The need of preserving a balanced condition among the powers of Europe had come to be recognized; and both England and Holland desired to maintain Austria as a check against their ancient enemy, France. After some eight years of fighting an advantageous peace for England was secured by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748.

A clash between French and English colonists in India in 1751 followed by the smothering of 146 English residents in the "Black Hole" of Calcutta in 1756 by the native Prince of Bengal, led to the establishment of the British Empire in India in 1757. Before this contest had closed, however, in Asia another had broken out in America. In Europe the aggressive activities of Frederick II of Prussia had produced such alarm that an alliance to check his further advance had been formed by France, Russia, Austria, and Poland. England found it for her interest to side with Frederick in order to prevent France from getting control of her American possessions. This course later induced France to lend her aid to the American colonists in securing their independence, and the latter were eventually successful.

Discontent among the Irish and European antagonisms of various sorts led to repeated schemes for the invasion of

Great Britain. An attempt which was made by a French fleet and 10,000 men under the guidance of Wolfe Tone on Ireland in December, 1796, was rendered fruitless by a storm, and another futile effort was made in Pembrokeshire; but the master stroke was arranged to be made by the united Dutch, French, and Spanish fleets. Nelson did much toward allaying the ardor of the latter off Cape Vincent, February 14, 1797; and the French and Dutch fleet of the Texel, which had sailed under De Winter with 15,000 men for the invasion of Ireland, was thoroughly defeated by Duncan at Camperdown, on October 11 of that year.

Napoleon, with his purpose of conquering the east set sail for Egypt May 20, 1798, and managed to escape the vigilance of Nelson, who, however, destroyed the French fleet after the troops had disembarked, in the Battle of the Nile August 1. Then Napoleon, with Spain's assistance, prepared to invade England in 1804; but the combined fleets of the two were driven by the English into Cadiz harbor. When in the spring of 1805 they left that harbor and had reached Cape Trafalgar, on the southern coast of Spain, the projected invasion of Great Britain collapsed; for their fleet was destroyed by Nelson in a naval battle. A few years later Sir Arthur Wellesley drove Napoleon's brother Joseph from the throne of Spain and the crown was restored to that nation.

The English opposition to Napoleon culminated Sunday, June 18, 1815, in the battle fought at Waterloo. Not all the forces of the allies were engaged, though, as they were, they greatly outnumbered the French. Austria had furnished 300,000 men; Russia, 170,000; Prussia, 124,000, under Blucher; and there were 95,000 Dutch and English under Wellington's immediate command. Napoleon had crossed the Sambre June 15, with 124,000 men and 350

cannon. Grouchy, with 34,000 men, was expected to hold back the Prussians under Blucher. Wellington, with a force of 72,000, was alined in front of the village of Waterloo when Napoleon and Ney, with an aggregate of 72,000 troops, made their attack. With the arrangement of the French artillery and the readiness of Napoleon's cavalry, experts have held that Wellington must have been defeated had Grouchy held Blucher's Prussians in check. The arrival of the latter turned the tide, and Napoleon's sun had set. Waterloo ended the second Hundred Years' War with France.

Since Waterloo, aside from internal troubles—notably the “Manchester Massacre” of 1819—have occurred the Opium War with China (1839); the War in the Crimea (1854); the Rebellion in India (1857); the War against the Dervishes of the Soudan (1896-1898); and the Boer War of 1899, in which England conquered the Dutch Republics of South Africa.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RISE OF RUSSIA.

Previous to the origin of modern Moscow and the ascension of George Danielovitch to its headship in 1303, which event followed closely the Lithuanian conquest, Russia's wars had been principally confined within her own borders, nor were these conditions changed for many years. There were wars about the right of headship of the royal family and the throne of Kief, and about other civil rights. Two terrible internal conflicts desolated Russia in the reign of the Grand Prince Sviatopolk (1093-1113), one with respect to the principality of Tchernigof, the other concerning Volhynia and Red Russia. Such wars include also those between the heirs of Vladimir Monomachus, attacks upon and capture of the capital, Kief; wars with Novgorod, in one battle of which, that of Lipetsk (1216), 9,000 men were killed and but sixty prisoners taken; wars of the Tartars, or Tartars, against the Polovsti, whom the Russians assisted, and the battle of the Kalka, in which 10,000 Kievians alone were slain; the battle of Riazan, in which the town was sacked and burned; the battle of Kolomna on the Oka, and of the Sit (1238), when "Russian heads fell beneath the sword of the Tartars as grass beneath the scythe"; when Moscow and thirteen other cities were given to the flames.



CZAR NICHOLAS
OF RUSSIA

There were also struggles between the contending influences as to the location of Russia's capital, ending with the establishment of the supremacy of Moscow. For upwards of two hundred years these contests continued; peace was unknown, nor were these internal dissensions brought to a close until the peace of 1494. However, peace was of short duration. Alexander, the second son of Casimir, took up arms to break the yoke imposed by the Polish Catholics upon the orthodox Russians. The struggle between Alexander, second son of Casimir IV of Luthuania and Poland, and Ivan or John III of Russia, beginning 1492, was a long-drawn-out series of bitter contests, ending in a truce of six years, brought about by the intercessions of Pope Alexander VI and the King of Hungary (1503). The succession of Vassili Ivanovitch, in 1505, brought no cessation to the internal troubles of the empire until he was banished to a monastery, being accused of heresy and of false interpretation of the sacred books. Throughout the reign of Ivan IV the country was torn by contending factions, the principal warlike event of his reign being the siege and reduction of the City of Kazan, in which the Tartar population was literally exterminated. During his reign the Russian Aristocracy were special victims of his fury. Against this class he continually waged a war of cruelty, destroying his enemies indiscriminately, and subsequently asking the prayers of the Church for his victims. He died in 1534, and was succeeded by Ivan the Terrible, who took the title of Tzar, and whose reign marked the introduction of printing in Russia, besides the expulsion of the Tartars and the waging of various foreign wars.

Ivan the Terrible was succeeded by Feodor Ivanovitch (1584), who shortly after his elevation found himself at war with both Sweden and Poland. The Poles refused to accept any monarch who was not a Catholic, and having chosen

Sigismond, son of the King of Sweden, as their ruler, Russia at once declared war. This war resulted disastrously to both Russia and Poland, as the latter practically lost her nationality, while Sweden elected Charles Vasa as her ruler. Feodor was succeeded by Boris Godounof (1598), whose reign was marked by a war with Sweden in which Russia recaptured all that had been taken from Ivan the Terrible—Iam, Ivan-gorod and Kaporie; also by the successful efforts made by Boris to conciliate and obtain the favor of England. An edict of his forbidding peasants to go from one estate to another practically bound the peasants to the soil and laid the foundation for bitterness and revolution. Upon his death, in 1605, Demitri, the Pretender (the real Demitri had been murdered, it was believed, by Boris, a runaway monk), ascended the throne. His real name was Gregory Otrepief, and he was assassinated in 1613, after a reign remarkable for naught save the sway of deceit and dishonor. Then followed the election of Michael Romanof (1613) and the foundation of the Russian royal family of that name. Under his regime the war with Sweden was brought to a close, and Russia, emerging from her centuries of internal turmoils, became a European nation. Peace reigned for a period of eight years, at the conclusion of which a holy war was declared by Turkey. Cossacks of the Don surprised and captured the City of Azof and offered it as a gift to the Tzar of Moscow, who declined to accept it and ordered its destruction. Upon the death of the first of the Romanofs, Alexis Mikhailovitch ascended the throne in 1645. The same year the breaking out of the Fronde in France (1648) was followed by the outbreak of a terrible revolt in Moscow, which defied the efforts of the army and was only quelled when the Tzar granted every concession demanded by those in the uprising. Rebellion broke out in Eastern

Russia in 1668, the forces in revolt being led by Stenko Razin, a Cossack of the Don. It was a war of the Tartars, Tchouvaches, Mordvians and Tcheremisses, against the domination of Russia, and ended only by the defeat of Razin in 1671. Razin was executed that year at Moscow. The reign of this Tzar Alexis, father of Peter the Great, marked the first efforts towards genuine reform in Russia. Alexis encouraged education, united the various religious schisms, and founded the Russian church. A religious revolt took place among the monasteries of the White Sea, where the monks, attached to their ancient customs, fortified the convent of Solovetski, and were only dislodged after a siege of eight years. It was then taken by assault and the rebels hung. Alexis had by his first wife, Maria Miloslavski, two sons (Feodor and Ivan) and six daughters, and by his second wife, Natalia Narychkin, one son (Peter the Great) and two daughters. As the kinsmen of each wife surrounded the throne, on the death of Feodor (1682), there were two factions contending for the succession.

The regency of Sophia, eldest daughter of Alexis, was marked by many stirring events, chief among them being the revolt of the people of Moscow, who, believing that Ivan, the son of Alexis, had been murdered, stoned the Kremlin, and, after they had ascertained that the stories of Ivan's death were not true, wreaked their vengeance by committing many outrages. The result was that Sophia triumphed and reigned in the name of her two sons, Ivan, a half-witted youth, and Peter. In 1689 she dispatched an army of 150,000 men to the Crimea to overcome the Ottoman forces in that country. Two expeditions were undertaken, both of which were unsuccessful.

Peter, then a young boy, quarreled with his mother, the Tzarina, and through the assistance of the advanced think-

ers, who supported his cause, the Tzarina's chief advisers were disgraced or executed, and Sophia was confined in a monastery, where she remained until her death, Peter taking the throne. In 1697 Peter suppressed a revolt of the Streltsi, or national guard, and soon after his return to Russia from a trip through Europe for the purpose of acquiring at first hand the knowledge necessary to develop his empire, caused a thousand to be executed, cutting off five heads himself. On his return to Russia, he began at once to set on foot the policy of seeking in every direction an outlet into ice-free seas, and selected the Black Sea as the most available for a first move. He secured for Russia access to the Black Sea on the south, and determined to dispute with Sweden for possession of the Baltic Sea on the north. It should be remembered that Finland, Carelia, Ingria, Esthonia and other districts east of the Baltic at this time all belonged to Sweden, and the possession of Pomerania, Rugen and Bremen made her one of the most important members of the German Empire. Russia was comparatively of small area and influence at this time. Peter made an alliance with Denmark and Poland and declared war, but his forces were defeated by the Swedish army under Charles XII at Narva on November 30, 1700. In 1703 Peter seized the Swedish fortress of Nyonschanz, near the mouth of the Neva, and there laid the foundation of the new capital, Saint Petersburg, now called Petrograd. During the following six years his armies were defeated by the Swedes, until, in 1709, Charles XII rashly invaded Russia, and his army was disastrously repulsed and cut to pieces at Pultowa. There the Swedish king confronted an entirely different force from the army he had routed at Narva six years before. Peter had disbanded the old regular army of the empire, the Strelitzes, and had employed foreign officers to instruct and drill his new army.

Charles XII had traversed Poland, being uniformly successful in all his campaigns until he arrived on the confines of Lithuania, within ten days' march of the Russian frontier, before which time the Tzar, alarmed at his approach, had made him proposals of peace. In October, 1708, the Swedish army, under General Lewenhaupt, met with a decided repulse near the Borysthenes, losing upwards of 8,000 men and all its cannon and ammunition, as well as all the provisions trains on which Charles and his starving army were relying. The Swedish forces went into winter quarters in the Ukraine, but, in the spring of 1709, moved forward toward Moscow and invested the fortified town of Pultowa, on the River Vorksea, a place where the Tzar had located large supplies of provisions and military stores. This position commanded the passes leading toward Moscow. A general engagement was inevitable, and in this battle the Russians, after two hours of desperate fighting, broke the Swedish lines and compelled the army of Charles to retire, with a loss of nearly 10,000 killed and wounded. A few survivors of the rout, Charles among the number, swam the Borysthenes river and escaped into Turkish territory.

The victory at Pultowa was the turning point in Russian ascendancy. Russia wrested from Sweden more than half her possessions; from Turkey in Europe, territory equal to Prussia; from Turkey in Asia, an area equal to the smaller states of Germany, the Rhenish provinces of Prussia, Belgium and Holland; from Persia, an extent equal to that of England, and for Tartary a territory equal to European Turkey, Greece, Italy and Spain.

During the war for the succession of Poland (1733-1735), during the reign of Catherine I, Russia could not be moved from her object to remain mistress of Poland and Courland. Severe fighting took place in Dantzic. Stanislaus, who had

secretly gained the capital and been declared King of Poland, was forced to flee, and, notwithstanding the aid of the French, the Russians were everywhere victorious.

Following this war, the French aroused the animosity of the Electors of Cologne, Mayence, Bavaria and the Palatinate, took Kehl and other fortified cities, and deprived Austria of the Duchy of Parma and the Kingdom of Naples. By virtue of the treaty of alliance of 1726, the Austrian emperor demanded help of the Tzarina, and General Lascy marched 20,000 men across Silesia, Bohemia and Franconia, displaying for the first time a Russian army in Western Germany. After he had joined forces with the Austrians within two miles of the French outposts near Heidelberg, hostilities were prevented by the Peace of Vienna, and the Russian troops withdrew.

A campaign against the Turks in 1736 by a Russian army led by Lascy resulted in great devastation in the eastern part of the peninsula. The latter pillaged the capital of the Khans, and laid waste the Crimea in such a manner that the country never recovered. The war resulted in the cession by Austria to Turkey of the provinces of Servia, Orsova and Wallachia, the Russians receiving as their share a tongue of land between the Bug and Dnieper rivers.

In October, 1741, Elizabeth Petrovna, daughter of Peter the Great, was, by the assistance of many who opposed the reign of the incapable Anna Ivanovna and regency of the indifferent Anne Leopoldavna, put forward as candidate for the throne. In this they were successful, most of the friends of Anne being arrested and punished according to the cruel barbarous methods then in vogue in Russia.

The war of 1741-43 with Sweden, brought on by that country in its efforts to secure the territory taken from them by Peter the Great, was soon ended. The Scandinavians

failed to show the prowess of former years. The Russian generals, Lascy and Keith, captured all the Finnish forts, while at Helsingfors, 17,000 Swedes laying down their arms to an inferior force of Russians. By the treaty of Abo the empress acquired South Finland as far as the River Kinen, and forced the election of Adolphus Frederick, administrator of the Duchy of Holstein, as Prince Royal of Sweden, in place of the native prince.

The war of the Austrian succession broke out previous to 1746. For many months Russian diplomats were undecided as to which side should be supported, but in the year mentioned an Austro-Russian treaty of alliance was concluded. In 1748 Russia took active measures to support her ally, when 30,000 troops were marched across Germany, under General Replin, and took their positions on the Rhine. This served to hasten the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748), after the conclusion of which the army returned to Russia without firing a shot or risking the prestige of the empire.

The hatred of Empress Elizabeth for Frederick the Great of Prussia was very pronounced. There was, perhaps, sufficient reason for the lady's sentiment towards the emperor, who did not spare epigrams about her. This personal feeling, continued for a number of years, added to other things, led finally to a diplomatic rupture. Partially as the result of a series of intrigues, Russia finally found herself an ally of France. In 1758 the Russians, under General Fermor, again invaded the Prussian states, took Königsberg, and bombarded Küstrin on the Oder. In a series of engagements, ending with the contest near Zorndorf, Frederick repelled the Russian "barbarians," as he was wont to refer to the soldiers of the empress. In the following year, Soltikoff, Fermor's successor, crossed the Oder with a Russian army, defeated the Prussians at Paltzig near Züllichau, and

marched without further hindrance into the city of Frankfurt. Frederick came to the assistance of his allies with a force of 48,000 men. He met the Russians near Kunersdorf, where he suffered defeat, losing all but 3,000 of his army. Frederick acknowledged that he saw defeat in the end, and made overtures for peace. The Russian empress declined to entertain proposals for peace until she had "reduced the forces" of Frederick and secured the annexation of eastern Prussia. In 1760, the Russians entered Berlin, pillaged the state coffers and arsenals and destroyed the manufactories of arms and powder. The following year they conquered Pomerania and captured the stronghold of Kolberg. It may be said that but for the sudden death of Elizabeth, Frederick would in all probability have lost most, if not all, of his provinces. Under the reign of Elizabeth, Russia made great progress in the arts and sciences, and also improved the morals and efficiency of her army.

The short reign of Peter III (1762), Duke of Holstein and admirer of Frederick the Great, was unmarked by the turmoil of war. Six months after his accession to power he was dethroned, and shortly thereafter strangled by Gregory Orlof, lover of the queen, and the latter was proclaimed ruler of all the Russias, with the title of Catherine II.

During the first five years of her reign Catherine II prosecuted her plans for the final dismemberment of Poland, and in 1768 a treaty was made between Poland and Russia by virtue of which the constitution of the former, largely the work of Russian diplomats, could never be modified without the consent of the latter power. This was to legalize foreign interventions and to nullify the growth of Poland. No sooner was this compact perfected than the Russian troops evacuated Warsaw, and the other powers, parties to the scheme, sent deputies to thank the empress. But peace did

not result. Confederations of Poles were formed at Bar in Podolia, in Galicia and Lublin. Agitation prevailed throughout the country, the result being that Poland found herself forced to commit an additional mistake. With a royal army numbering less than 10,000 men, application under the treaty was made to Russia for aid. A savage war followed, at once national, religious and social, which desolated the provinces of the Dnieper. The landowners and Jews saw the return of the bloody days of Khmelnitski. The massacre of Ouman, a town belonging to Count Potocki, horrified all Europe. In the end, however, the Russian troops were victorious over the Polish patriots.

These events were succeeded by the first war with Turkey (1767-74). At the instigation of France, Turkey declared war against Russia. General Galitsyne, with 30,000 men, defeated the Grand Vizier, with a force of 100,000, on the Dnieper, near Khotin. In 1770, his successor, General Rouanstof, defeated the Khan of the Tartars, with 100,000 men, and followed this with a victory over the Grand Vizier at Kagoul, where 150,000 Turks were defeated by 17,000 Russians. In 1771 Prince Dolgourki forced the lines of Perekop, ravaged the Crimea, proceeded to Kaffa, Keortch and Ienikale, and put an end forever to Turkish rule in the peninsula. The previous year a Russian fleet had sailed out of the Baltic, made the tour of Europe, and, appearing on the coast of Greece, overcame the Turkish fleet in the harbor of Chios, conquered Azof, the Crimea, and gained control of the shore of the Black Sea between the Dnieper and the Dniester, Bessarabia, Wallachia, Neoldovia, a part of Bulgaria and the islands of the Archipelago. Russia would willingly have kept her conquests, but Austria took fright at her close neighborhood and raised opposition. It was at this

point that the Turkish and Polish question crossed; Poland was made to serve as the ransom of Turkey.

The proposition to dismember Poland was suggested to Catharine II by Frederick of Prussia, who sent his brother, Prince Henry, to St. Petersburg to gain over the empress. The prince succeeded in presenting the question so forcibly that Catherine, who, realizing that she could not fight both Austria and Prussia at the same time, was finally forced to submit to the proposal of Frederick II. The partition was formally legalized by the treaty of February, 1771, between Prussia and Russia, and accepted by Austria in September following.

This compact rendered the settlement of Russia's differences with the Porte comparatively easy. The Russian army at this moment had the forces of the Grand Vizier surrounded at Shumla, in a position where Turkish defeat might open the way to Constantinople. Sultan Abdul Hamid therefore consented to sign the Peace of Koutchouk-Kairnadji (1174).

Affairs in Sweden soon after attracted the attention of the powers. Gustavus III, while still prince royal, visited Paris, associated himself closely with the aristocratic circles of France, and, being recalled by the death of his father, returned to Sweden, determined to re-establish the royal power, with the hope of securing the independence of the country. He then prepared his coup d'état with the utmost secrecy, having already gained the support of the nation, including the army. On August 19, 1772, he overthrew the assembly and imposed on the Diet a new constitution, which guaranteed the public liberties, at the same time restoring to the crown its essential prerogatives. The revolution, accomplished without bloodshed, put Sweden beyond the power of foreign intrigue, and caused great mortification to Fred-

erick and Catherine, neither of whom was in position to interfere, because of the condition of Poland.

Following the terrible plague at Moscow, during the summer of 1771, and the fright caused thereby in the minds of superstitious people, the city was terrorized by destructive and frenzied mobs. Much damage was done, but, the plague subsiding, peace was restored, though the result of this revolt in Moscow was soon apparent in several of the provinces. Prejudiced against being ruled by women, the ignorant peasants accepted the leadership of imposters, and finally selected Emilian Pougatchef, a Cossack deserter and outlaw, to lead them in an insurrection against the empress. A race war, having the dangerous elements of social distinction, began in the basin of the Volga. Entire districts were desolated by the revolutionists, who destroyed several of the most prosperous cities in the south. Pougatchef was finally captured and brought to Moscow, where he was beheaded.

In 1787 conditions indicated that war with Turkey was to be expected. In the midst of her preparations to combat the Ottoman government, Catharine received the ultimatum of Turkey, demanding the recall of Russian Consuls from Jassy, Bucharest and Alexandria; abandonment of the protectorate over Heraclius, vassal of the Sultan; the right of the Turks to inspect all Russian vessels navigating the straits, and the admission of Turkish Consuls into the ports of Russian territory. On the refusal of these demands, the Porte declared a war, which raged during the succeeding five years. In 1788 Catherine had 40,000 men to protect the Caucasus; 30,000 to defend the Crimea, and 70,000 under Roumantsof to operate on the Dniester, while 80,000 Austrians, under Joseph II, were on the line of the Danube and the Save. The Austrians were driven beyond

the Save and were defeated at 'Temesvar, when the Emperor resigned his command to Laudon. The war continued with unabated fury. In 1790, Catherine, following the storming and capture of the fortress of Ismail, the strongest in Turkey, learned of the death of Joseph II and the succession of Leopold II, who signed a peace at Sistova (1791), but continued the war for several months till the fall of Akkerman and Kilia. General Repnin, with 40,000 men, defeated the Grand Vizier, with 100,000, at Matchin, and the Grand Vizier's communications with Constantinople were destroyed. The Sultan implored peace, the Turks, however, escaping expulsion into Asia, a fate which they anticipated.

Actual hostilities between Russia and Poland, following the efforts of the latter country to avoid war, did not actually begin until April 17, 1791, when the tocsin sounded in all directions and the insurrection led by Thaddeus Kosciuszko broke out. King Stanislaus remained in his palace, taking no part in the uprising. Varying success followed the efforts of the Polish generals, but when Kosciuszko was disabled and taken from the field on the Vistula, his successor Varrjevski retreated to Praga, which was hastily fortified to resist the oncoming victorious Russians. At 3 o'clock on the morning of November 4th, 1794, the assault began. The ramparts were speedily scaled, and Praga was within two hours the scene of one of the most bloody encounters in all history. The Russian General Souvorof pleaded in vain for quarter for the vanquished. The soldiers, exasperated against the Poles, whom they believed to be atheists and accomplices of the French Jacobins, murderers of their comrades, disarmed in the revolt of April 17th, cut down without mercy the entire Polish Army. The dead numbered 12,000, the prisoners only one. Souvorof

was made Field Marshal by the Empress. In the partition which followed, Russia took the rest of Lithuania as far as the Niemen, and the rest of Volhynia to the Bug, and finally acquired Courland and Samogitia. But notwithstanding this overwhelming victory, and defeat of their cherished ambition for a reunited country, the Poles remained undaunted.

Catherine had been really more useful to France than to the coalition—and this despite of her own wishes. Prussia and Austria had both become suspicious of her because of her intervention in Poland and her projects in the east. But she played one country against the other; made the second partition of Poland with Frederick William in spite of Austria; and effected the third partition with Francis II of Austria, to the disgust of Prussia. When she died, in November, 1796, the frontiers of Russia had been extended more than by any previous sovereign since the term of Ivan the Terrible. She had gained the boundaries of the Niemen, the Dniester, and the Black Sea.

Paul I, upon his succession to the throne, on November 17, 1796, was forty-two years of age. He was a man of some natural ability, but a despot at heart, and had always been eccentric, and had constantly acted in opposition to his mother.

Questioned by the Austrians on his passage to Vienna as to his orders, Suvoroff showed them a blank paper signed by the Emperor Paul. His military formulae, given to his soldiers, was: "A sudden glance, rapidity, impetuosity! The van of the army is not to wait for the rear! Musket balls are fools; bayonets do the business; the French beat the Austrians in columns, and we will beat them in columns!"

Beginning with the autumn of 1798, Europe was again racked by a warlike combination, destined to change the

map of the entire continent. Owing to its seizure of the Ionian Islands, the French Directory found itself suddenly confronted by a coalition including Italy, Switzerland, Holland and Naples, soon to be augmented by the forces of England and Russia.

Suvoroff, the Russian commander, assumed command of the allied forces, the Austro-Russians outnumbering the French under Moreau more than three to one. Souvoroff crossed the River Adda, penetrated the center of Moreau, and surrounded the right wing of his army, capturing about 3,000 prisoners. Forcing Moreau into the Alps for refuge, Suvoroff entered Milan amidst the acclamation of the nobles, priests and excited populace, of all the enemies of the revolution, and immediately abolished the Cisalpine Republic.

After defeating the Austrians on the Tidona, the French Marshal McDonald, at the head of the army of Naples, came up with Suvoroff on the Trebbia. A fierce engagement ensued, each army losing about twelve thousand men, when McDonald rejoined Moreau in the gorges of the Alps. In the latter part of July, 1799, the Directorate made and lost its contest to recover Italy. Quarrels arose in the ranks of the allies, resulting in the separation of the Russians and Austrians, the latter not being able to endure the vanity of Suvoroff. The result was that Suvoroff took command of a force dispatched to defend the mountains of Helvetia. Marshal Massena was quietly waiting with a force of 60,000 men on the heights of Albis, for an opportunity to strike Suvoroff. September 25 he surprised the passage of the Linimatt, near Dietikon, and cut the Russian Army in two. The battle continued all the next day, when the Russians fell back on Zurich, leaving the field covered with dead and wounded. They had lost 6,000 men, their guns,

the army treasure, official papers, and sacred plate. Then Marshal Oudinot attacked Zurich, the Swiss legion, and took all the Russian stores and baggage.

Suvoroff, forced to retreat, was compelled to take his army over the St. Gotthard Pass, during which march his men suffered great hardships, reaching Multenthal on the 26th of September, after losing 2,000 of his army. In his retreat he successfully made the passage across Mont Bragel in the deep snow and intense cold, and, with the remnant of his army, went into winter quarters between the Iller and the Lech rivers.

During the short alliance between Paul and Napoleon, the former, having broken with England owing to the fact that the latter would not recognize him as Grand Master of Malta and owner of the island, a Russo-French expedition was planned to conquer British India.

The death of Emperor Paul (March 23, 1801), and the ascension of Alexander I were followed immediately by the series of contests in which Napoleon as First Consul of France, and afterwards Emperor, practically disrupted all of Europe, and made himself dictator of the policies of the powers. Alexander, the new Russian Czar, made unsuccessful efforts to bring about peace between the warring nations of the continent, having in view, however, the domination of Russia so far as concerned the control of Poland, the Dardanelles, and Sweden. In his demands in favor of Sardinia, the Emperor did not feel that he had the support of England. On October 8, 1801, a treaty was signed between France and Russia, followed by the adoption, on October 11, of the following articles: 1—Mediation for the German indemnities stipulated by the peace of Luneville. 2—An agreement regarding Italian affairs. 3—Mediation of Russia for peace between France and Turkey.

4—Evacuation by the French of the territory of Naples. 5—Indemnity of Sardinia. 6—Indemnity to sovereigns of Bavaria, Wurtemberg and Baden. 7—The independence of the Ionian islands. In all these affairs the will of France predominated. Here followed more or less diplomatic intrigue preceding the execution of the Duc d'Enghien, owing to the increased misunderstanding between the French and Russian cabinet. Because of this event, Hedouville, the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg, found himself *persona non grata* at the Russian Court. The French government was presented with a note protesting against the violation of international law. A similar note was laid before the Diet at Ratisbon, which Sweden and England hastened to ratify. The French Minister was recalled. France replied with an insulting letter to the correspondence implying Russia's right to interfere in the affairs of Germany, and, as a result, all diplomatic relations were broken off. Napoleon had just been crowned Emperor; had taken the crown of Italy, united Genoa to the French territory, and modified the constitution of Holland. He had threatened England, and was preparing for its invasion, when the coalition against him became public. Britain entered the list against him, followed by Sweden and Naples; Austria attacked Bavaria, the ally of Napoleon, and war became inevitable. Alexander, following the violation of the territory of Anspach and Baireuth, held his famous interview, near the tomb of Frederick the Great, with the King and Queen of Prussia, followed by the treaty of Potsdam, Prussia undertaking to furnish 80,000 soldiers, provided Napoleon did not accept this ultimatum, which stipulated the independence of Germany and Italy and payment of an indemnity to the King of Sardinia.

During the negotiations the Russian army was being

mobilized. Beside the three Austrian armies in Italy, the Tyrol and Bavaria, there were put in motion 20,000 men under Tolstoi, 20,000 under Admiral Seniavine, who were to join the English at Naples, and the great army of Germany, consisting of 45,000, hastening to the river Inn, to unite with Mack, the force including all the Imperial Guards, the flower of the army. General Koutovzof had reached Braunau, on the Inn, when the news reached him of the capitulation of Ulm, and the annihilation of Mack's army. To escape being cut off on the right bank of the Danube by Murat's cavalry, and on the left bank by the corps of Mortier, Koutovzof retreated, giving battle to Oudinot at Laueback in Amstettin. He then crossed the Danube at Krems, fought the battle of Dirnstein with Mortier, and marched north to join the great Russian Army. A surprise at the bridge of Vienna by Lannes and Murat endangered his left flank, when he found that in order to save his army his rear guard must be sacrificed. He entrenched himself at Hollabrunn. Murat came up first. He wished to gain time in order to allow Lannes to join him and granted an armistice, but Napoleon, incensed at the delay, ordered an immediate attack. A desperate engagement of twelve hours' duration followed, when under cover of night the Russian army retreated, having lost 2,000 men and all its guns. The Russian and Austrian troops numbering 80,000 men were concentrated at Olmutz, while Napoleon, with 70,000 men, was concentrating at Brunn.

But in the battle of Austerlitz the Russians were defeated and forced to retreat. On December 4, after an audience with the emperor, Napoleon allowed the Russian army to retire, on condition that it was to return to Russia by stages, its progress to be regulated by himself. On the 26th the Treaty of Presburg was signed, under which Francis II of

Austria gave up the Tyrol and Austrian Swabia, and also the title of emperor. The King of Naples was dethroned and replaced by Joseph Bonaparte, Murat became Grand Duke of Berg, and, in fact, the entire map of northeastern Europe was changed at the dictation of the little Corsican.

The defeat of the coalition and the divisions affected under this wholesale partition by Napoleon, and the desertion of Austria, left Russia almost alone on the continent. During the following year, a coalition between Russia, England, Sweden and Prussia was made, but Russia bore the brunt of the struggle. The French occupied Berlin, and took the fortresses on the Oder and the Vistula. Nothing remained to Frederick William in the north but three fortresses, Dantzic, Königsberg and Memel, and a small army of 14,000 men under Lestocq.

After Austerlitz, Russia tried to negotiate with Napoleon, but her overtures met with no success. The result was that Alexander, secure against Prussia, began the formation of a new army, recruiting one man in every hundred in the empire. He summoned students and young nobles to his assistance, promising to them promotion after six months' service. The priests were ordered to proclaim everywhere that war was made—"was made not for vainglory, but for the salvation of the country." England was asked for a loan of 6,000,000 francs, and Austria was appealed to for help. An army of 88,000 men was mobilized, with Field Marshal Kamenski at its head. The infirmities of the latter soon brought about retirement, and Bennigsen succeeded him, a man of boundless energy, though not a professional soldier.

Marshals Murat, Davoust and Lannes had entered Warsaw, then a Prussian possession. Soult and Augereau crossed the Vistula at Modlin and formed the center; in the left, Ney and Bernadotte occupied Thorn and Elburg; Mor-

tier acted in Pomerania against the Swedes; Lefebvre besieged Dantzic, and Jerome Bonaparte with Vandamme finished the conquest of Silesia. Pressed by the Grand Army, Bennigsen was obliged to evacuate Poland, after severe fighting, and retired by way of Ostrolenka, leaving in the marshes and mud of Poland eighty field pieces and nearly 10,000 of his men.

While the Grand Army were in winter quarters, Bennigsen conceived the bold project of passing between the forces of Bernadotte and Ney, and forcing the latter into the sea, thus relieving Dantzic and carrying the war into Broudenberg located in rear of Napoleon. Bennigsen was disastrously defeated; however, he reorganized the remnant of his army at Eylau, and took up a position to the east of the town, on a line of heights extending from Schloditten to Serpallen, his front covered by 250 pieces of cannon. The battle of Eylau was stubbornly fought, was in fact one of the bloodiest of the country, but Bennigsen again suffered defeat (Feb. 8, 1807). That field of snow, strewn with the slain, afforded one of the most tragic exhibitions in the history of warfare. The French subsequently suffered greatly from the extreme cold and underwent numberless privations. Then followed the treaty of Bartenstein (April 25, 1807), which provided for: 1. The re-establishment of Prussia; 2. Dissolution of the Confederacy of the Rhine; 3. The restitution to Austria of the Tyrol and Venice; 4. The accession of England to the coalition, and the aggrandizement of Hanover; and 5. The co-operation of Sweden. This treaty was important, as it nearly presented the conditions offered Napoleon at the Congress of Prague in 1813.

In the spring of 1808, Bennigsen, at the head of 100,000 men, took the offensive. He tried again to seize Ney's division, but the latter fought, as he retired, two bloody en-

gements, at Gutstadt and Aukendorff, when Bennigsen, in danger of being surrounded, retired on Heilsberg. He was finally forced to make a stand at Friedland on the Alle. Here, on June 14, the Russians were again defeated, losing from 15,000 to 20,000 men and eighty guns. Alexander had no longer an army. Only one man, Barclay de Tolly, proposed to continue the war, but in order to do this, it would be necessary to re-enter Russia, to penetrate to the very heart of the Empire, to burn everything on the way, and only present a desert to the enemy. Alexander hoped to get off more cheaply. He wrote a severe letter to Bennigsen and gave him power to treat. Prince Lobanof left on a mission to Napoleon, who sent in his turn Captain de Talleyrand Perigord. "Alexander had at that time," says Rambaud, "a common sentiment with Napoleon—hatred of the English. He neither pardoned them for their refusal to guarantee a Russian loan, nor for the calculated insufficiency of their diversions, nor for their mercantile selfishness."

On June 25 (1807), the famous interview on the raft at Tilsit took place. Alexander and Napoleon conversed for nearly two hours, the King of Prussia being barred from participating in a conference on which depended the fate of his dynasty. Napoleon stated it was from "respect for the Emperor of Russia, and desire to unite the two nations in a bond of eternal friendship," that he consented to restore to Frederick William III, Old Prussia, Pomerania, Brandenburg and Silesia. These articles were the finishing blow to the fall of Prussia. On the west she was deprived of all her possessions between the Rhine and the Elbe, with Magdeburg. Napoleon deprived her allies of Brunswick and Cassel, and on the east, confiscated all Poland. He thus broke the two wings of the Prussian eagle. On its right he established the Kingdom of Westphalia; on its left, the Grand

Duchy of Warsaw. Dantzic was declared a free town, the district of Belostok, part of dismembered Black Russia, again became Russian territory. The states of the princes of Mecklenburg and Oldenburg were restored to them, but they had to suffer the occupation of their territory for the carrying out of the continental blockade, and, like Saxony, the states of Thuringa, and all the smaller princes of Germany, they were forced to accede to the confederation of the Rhine. The King of Prussia adhered to the continental blockade. His dominions were not to be given back to him till after the complete payment of a war indemnity.

Two treaties were made relative to Prussia, that of Tilsit, and a second which was secret. A third treaty, both offensive and defensive, provided that an ultimatum should be made to England on the first of November, and that if it had no results, war should be declared against her by Russia on December 1st; that Turkey should be allowed a delay of three months to make her peace with the Tzar, and that then the two high contracting powers should come to an understanding to liberate all the Ottoman provinces in Europe, Constantinople and Roumelia excepted, from the yoke of the Turks; that Sweden should be summoned to break with England, and if she refused Denmark was to be invited to take part in the war against her, and Finland was to be annexed to Russia, and that Austria should be invited to accede to a system of continental blockade at the same time as Sweden, Denmark and Portugal.

This change in the foreign policy was to bring with it a change in the composition of the government. New leaders were substituted in nearly every department. These changes and a rapidly growing antipathy towards the French nation and French ideas, previously in great vogue in Russia, caused discontent among the people.

The alliance concluded at Tilsit and confirmed at Erfurt was to involve Russia in three new wars—one against England, another against Sweden, and a third against Austria. Besides these, the wars which had begun with Turkey in 1806, and against Persia and the Caucasus, still continued. After the war with Austria (1809, April), or what has been termed the "comedy of contest," there followed the Treaty of Vienna, at which Russia was not represented. The emperor did not intend to sanction the results, and by so doing left Austria unsupported. She was consequently obliged to make numerous sacrifices. The Illyrian provinces and all of Galicia were ceded. Napoleon added Western Galicia, with 1,500,000 people, to the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, while he gave Eastern Galicia and a population of 400,000 to Russia (Oct. 14, 1809).

The Servians were now becoming restless, their turbulent militia entering into a contest with the Pasha of Belgrade, and even defied the authority of the Sultan. They rose against the Janissaries and expelled all the Mussulmans from Belgrade. They would have been crushed by the Sultan had not Alexander sent them a corps under Colonel Bala. This difference was adjusted at the Congress of Bucharest in 1812, with the agreement that the Servians should remain subject to the Sultan, but should be governed by their own local governor and assembly.

The estrangement between Alexander and Napoleon became greater daily, the most important causes being: 1. The growth of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw; 2. The dissatisfaction of Napoleon at the conduct of the Russians in the campaign of 1809; 3. The abandonment of the project of a Russian marriage, and the substitution of an Austrian marriage; 4. The increasing rivalry of the two states at Con-

stantinople and on the Danube; 5. The Napoleonic encroachments of 1810 in northern Germany; 6. The irritation produced by the continental blockade; 7. Finally the mistrust occasioned by the respective armaments.

In 1810 the *Senatus Consultum*, by the decree of July, pronounced the union of the whole of Holland to the French empire; by the decree of December, the future union of three Hanseatic towns of Oldenburg and other German territories. Where were these encroachments to stop? Hamburg, Bremen and Lubeck, free towns, whose commerce was an object of interest to the whole world, and especially to Russia, had become French. The annexation of Oldenburg provoked Alexander deeply. He saw his sister Catherine and her husband robbed of their crowns and forced to fly to St. Petersburg. As to the continental blockade, although it was observed by Russia less strictly than by France, Russia still suffered cruelly from it. Her commerce was greatly injured and the value of her money had fallen. In December, 1810, Alexander promulgated an edict, which, with the apparent design of preventing specie from leaving the country, proscribed the importation of objects of luxury from whatever country they might come. This chiefly struck at French commerce. The forbidden goods were ordered in every instance to be burned. Napoleon was exasperated as a consequence, and everything pointed to war as inevitable.

At the Court of Murat, King of Naples, the French Envoy, Durand, fought a duel with the Russian Envoy, Dalgorouki. Alexander disgraced Speranski, the friend of France, and sent for Stein, the great German patriot, Napoleon's mortal foe, placed by him under the ban of the Confederation. Russia concluded peace with Turkey, negotiated with Sweden for an alliance, and with England for a treaty of subsidies. Napoleon signed two conventions with Prus-

sia and Austria, which assured him the support of 20,000 Prussians and 30,000 Austrians in the projected expeditions. On May 9, 1812, Napoleon left Paris for his army. Ambassadors Kourakine and Lauriston were given their passports.

When the Grand Army prepared to cross the Niemen for the invasion of Russia, Napoleon had 290,000 men, half of whom were French. The left was in front of Tilsit, 10,000 French under McDonald, and 20,000 Prussians under General York of Wartenburg. Napoleon was with the center before Kovno, including the corps of Davoust, Oudinot and Ney, the guard under Bessieres, and cavalry reserve under Murat, a total of 180,000 men. Before Pily, Eugene's command included 50,000 Italians and Bavarians, and the extreme right, before Grodno, was the command of Jerome Bonaparte, with 60,000 Poles, Saxons, etc.

Alexander had collected on the Niemen 90,000 men, under Bagration, on the Bug, 60,000, under Barclay de Tolly. On the extreme right, Wittgenstein, with 30,000, was to oppose McDonald, and Tormassof had 40,000 men to support this line. Later this latter army, reinforced by 50,000 men from the Danube, under Admiral Tchitchagof, was seriously to embarrass the retreat of the French. In the rear of all these forces was a reserve of 80,000 men, Cossacks and militia. As a matter of fact, however, Russia had only 150,000 to oppose the allies. He counted on the devotion of the nation.

The greatest mistake ever made by Napoleon was in not re-establishing the Kingdom of Poland as a buffer state, but in invading Russia instead.

Murat reached Krasure, and a fierce battle was fought there August 14. Another desperate fight occurred at Smolensk on the 16th, 17th, and 18th, the place being taken

and burned. Some 20,000 men were killed. Ney fought the retreating army of Bagration at Valoutina; and 15,000 men of both armies perished in the conflict.

The Russians fell back, burning towns and destroying provisions. Koutouzof, with the united armies of Barclay and Bagration, halted at Borodino, near Moskowa. He had 72,000 infantry, 18,000 regular cavalry, 7,000 cossacks, 10,000 militia, and 640 cannon, served by 14,000 artilleryists; in all, 121,000 men.

Napoleon had concentrated from his marching columns 130,000 men—86,000 infantry, 28,000 cavalry, and 587 guns, served by 16,000 artilleryists.

Beginning the battle with a frightful artillery fire, the infantry charges of the French were successful in forcing the Russians back and after an obstinate fight at the outworks, Koutouzof gave the signal to retreat. The French lost 30,000 men, including 49 generals and 37 colonels, killed or wounded. The Russian loss was greater; yet this battle was the death-blow to Napoleon's purpose. He could concentrate 100,000 men, and Koutouzof but 50,000; but the French losses at this distance from their base were irreparable.

The invasion proceeded and the burning city of Moscow entered September 14th; and on the 19th of October the Grand Army, with famine and desolation staring it in the face, began its retreat. More than 10,000 men had already perished from hunger; and bands of armed peasants, of guerillas, and Cossacks were threatening on all sides. The roads in all directions save that to Smolensk, which had been laid waste, were barred by Russian armies.

In the battle of Viasma, November 3rd, Ney and Eugene defeated 40,000 Russians; but victories counted for little to men perishing with hunger and cold. Only 40,000 French

crossed the Berezina the last of November, while 140,000 Russians were around and behind them. The sick and wounded French left in the houses at Vilna were thrown out of the windows. Thirty thousand corpses were burned on piles; and when Ney recrossed the Niemen with the last remnant of the Grand Army 330,000 of its members were left behind dead or in prison.

Alexander reorganized his army and after the battle of Dresden (Aug. 26, 1813) the Russian troops under Barclay, Ostermann and Ermolof attacked and captured nearly half of the French under Vandamme (Aug. 30) at Kulm. Russian troops participated in the victory over the French at Leipsic October 19; and also in the defeats at St. Didier, Montmirail, Chateau Thierry, and Mormans and Montereau (Feb. 17-18). At Craonne (March 7) the Russian loss of 5,000 was one-third their effective force, while the battle of Leon (March 9-10), in which Napoleon was defeated, cost them 4,000 men.

At the Congress of Vienna (Oct. 2), besides the settlement of the position of France, occurred the fourth partition of Poland, in which Russia gained 3,000,000 (Kingdom of Poland) inhabitants. The gains of Prussia in the distribution were 5,392,000 souls (Western Poland, Saxony, Swedish Pomerania, Westphalia, and the Rhenish provinces), and Austria 10,000,000 (Galicia, Germany and Italy).

The Emperor Alexander was much of a mystic, and to him is accredited the Holy Alliance signed in September, after Waterloo, by the crowned heads of Russia, Prussia and Austria; and also the expulsion of the Jesuits from Russia, March 25, 1820. Yet his religion does not appear to have interfered with the national policy of extending Russian domination.

In 1821, the Balkan states, largely peopled by the co-religionists of the Russians, evinced much uneasiness as to their state of subjection to the Ottoman yoke. The Greeks had formally proclaimed their independence of Turkey on March 25, 1821; and the Hetairia, or patriotic society, was promulgated in all the provinces and islands of Greece. One martyr, Rigas, was delivered up by the Austrians and executed by the Turks. Ypsilanti, the patriot leader who had served in the Russian ranks, did not believe that the Tzar would fail to support him. But the influence of Metternich, the Austrian Premier, was more potent. Servia had taken up arms also under Miloš Obrenvitch, and looked to Alexander for assistance. What happened? At the feast of Easter, Greeks and Servians were assaulted by the Turks generally, and the Patriarch at Constantinople was seized at the altar and hung at the door of his church in his priestly robes. The Grand Vizier watched with amusement the populace drag his corpse through the streets. Three metropolitans and eight bishops were slain. All Russia trembled with indignation. But the Tzar exchanged notes with the Porte, and the courts of England and Austria—and the massacres continued. But Russia in the meanwhile increased her territory by the addition of Finland, Poland, Bessarabia, and part of the Caucasus. To their indifference, the Russian people attributed the terrible inundation at St. Petersburg, and the premature and mysterious death of Alexander which followed.

The reign of Nicholas I was ushered in (December, 1825) by a conspiracy and insurrection, which was soon quelled, though the aim of the rebels seems to have been to secure the independence of the peasants, a greater equality of rights, and more stability in the law.

The next year war broke out with Persia—which lasted

two years; and also a war with Turkey which ran three years, the liberation of Greece being effected in the year (1829). The Polish insurrection of 1831, and the intervention in Hungary in 1848 which seated Francis Joseph on the throne of the Dual Monarchy, were the chief military events preceding the second outbreak with Turkey and the Crimean war extending from March, 1854, to March, 1856, in which England, France, and Sardinia, were allied with Turkey against Russia.

The losses in the battles of the Alma, Balaklava, Inkermann, Tchernaya, and assaults on the forts were as follows: English—killed and dead from wounds, 3,500; dead from cholera and other diseases, 22,000. The French lost some 63,500 men, and the Russians 500,000.



FRANZ JOSEPH
EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA

CHAPTER VII.

GERMANY AND PRUSSIA.

Though Caesar termed the Belgians "the bravest" from the time of the victory of Arminius (4 A. D.), the Germans continued to be the most dangerous enemies of Rome. As we have seen, Constantine and Julian had to make strenuous efforts to withstand the Germans, as did Valentinian later; and the Germans, from their service in the Roman armies, as well as in other ways, gained in experience, strength and courage, and really grew stronger as the Romans grew weaker.

As the Roman idea of empire was based upon Greek models, so the German idea, as well as that of the French, was founded upon the Roman. The glory of the state was placed before that of any individual, the Emperor alone being excepted; for he was the head of the State, by divine right.

The religion of the Germans but served to accentuate their warlike tendencies. They believed in the great god Woden, his brother Frey, and his son Thor, who were all supposed to live in a gorgeous palace called Valhalla—Val meaning a brave death in battle.

The Goths were a German people, who settled in Trojan's province of Dacia, north of the Danube. Though forced

back by the Huns in the fourth century, they were never driven out of Europe. Savagery and lawlessness prevailed among all the different German tribes. Conrad, chief of the Salians, was the first elected emperor (912); but when he found that his own following was not strong enough he advocated and caused to be elected his adversary, Henry of Saxony, known as the Fowler, who was crowned at Fritzlar, in Hesse, in April, 919. Soon his sway was acknowledged by the Dukes of Swabia, Bavaria, and Lorraine. He defeated the Wends, a powerful Slavic tribe, at the battle of Lenzen in 929, when 200,000 of them are said to have been slain. The Germans had continued to resist the devastating invasions of the Hungarians or Magyars, decade after decade and century after century, till Henry defeated them in a decisive battle at Merseburg, March 15, 933. Otto succeeded Henry (936 A. D.), and it was Otto's victory on the Lechfield (955) that put an end to the incursions of the Huns and forced them to settle in the territory they now occupy. The Franks, another German tribe, occupying the banks of the Rhine and regions westward, had assisted greatly in this result, as we have seen, by the defeat of Attila at the battle of Soissons (485).

Otto was the first to acquire the Roman Imperial crown, with which he was crowned in the church of St. Peter's in Rome in February, 936, by Pope John XII. As Otto now assumed all the rights of control over Rome formerly exercised by Charlemagne, Pope John rebelled and entered into a conspiracy with the ex-king Berengar, to secure the aid of Constantinople and of the Hungarians. Otto, on learning of this, returned to Rome, deposed Pope John, and elected Leo VIII as Pope. Thus the Imperial dignity was won for the German power, and the Empire was joined permanently to itself. From this time on whoever was crowned

King of Germany had the right to be crowned King of Italy at Milan and Emperor at Rome. Italy was thus again united with the Kingdom of Germany.

Otto II succeeded his father, and reigned till 980, waging wars with the Danes,—forcing King Harold to become a Christian,—and also with the Eastern Emperors over Southern Italy. Otto III, known as the “Wonder of the World,” desired to make Rome the Capital of the world again. But his plans were cut short by death in 1002, and his successor Henry II, descended from Henry the Fowler, was the last Saxon Emperor.

During the reigns of the Franconian Emperors (1024-1114) the domain increased. Burgundy was joined to the Empire (1032) during the reign of Conrad II; the quarrel between the rival claimants for the Popedom occurred during the reign of Henry III; the Saxons revolted in 1077, during Henry IV’s reign; and the king, after wandering about half-starved and selling his boots to buy bread, died at Liege in 1106, Henry V dying three years later.

During this period, which marks the beginning of the Middle Ages, the two great powers in Western Europe were the Empire and the Church. It was held that of divine right there were two Vicars of God upon earth, a temporal one, the Emperor, and a spiritual one, the Pope. This view was adhered to more consistently in the case of the Pope than of the Emperor, but it was held by the Emperors themselves, as well.

Germany was now the center of the Empire of the West, though, through the control of Italy and Burgundy, it had many subjects speaking the Latin tongues; while the Wends, of Slavic origin, dwelling along the south coast of the Baltic, in Mecklenburg and Pomerania, as well as in

other lands beyond the Elbe, gradually acquired the Low-Dutch in place of Slavonic.

Conrad III (1137-1152), the first of the Swabian Emperors, took active part in the second crusade, and the civil wars began in his reign between the imperial and papal parties, called the Ghibellines and Guelphs.

Frederick Barbarossa, during his reign (1152-1190), was forced to make no less than six expeditions into Italy to keep that country under control. Milan and some other cities in Lombardy tried to erect their territories into small republics. Frederick also engaged in a violent quarrel with Pope Alexander III, which brought on a war, and the Emperor's forces were defeated at the battle of Legnano (1176 A. D.).

At Frederick's death Germany was divided as to who should become king, there being three princes, Frederick, Philip, and Otto, who had all been chosen kings of the Romans. Little Frederick, the son of Henry VI, was but three years old; Philip, Duke of Swabia, was the only son of Barbarossa; and Otto, Duke of Brunswick, was the son of Henry the Lion. Pope Innocent III, although Philip had begun to reign, decided in favor of Otto. Germany thus had two kings till 1208, when Philip was murdered in the Tyrol, the assassin being slain shortly after by Philip's son-in-law. Otto mixed himself up in a quarrel of the Duke of Brabant, the Count of Flanders, and others, with King Philip Augustus; and in a terrible battle fought at Bouvines in 1214 Otto and his allies were defeated. In fact the entire interval between Barbarossa's death and the ascension of the Hapsburgs (1190-1273) was filled with internal and foreign wars.

Frederick II (1212-1250) made two expeditions to the Holy Land and had various contests with Italian cities and

with the Pope. His son Manfred fell fighting for his kingdom at the battle of Beneventum.

The condition of the German Empire became such at this period that the crown was offered for sale to the highest bidder. Various offers were made and the matter was referred to the Pope, who promised to settle it, but did not; and Germany was in a state of turbulence for many years. Historians note an interregnum in the German Empire from 1254, the date of the death of Conrad IV, to the election of Rudolph in 1273; and these nineteen years are filled with bitter quarrels, warfare and murder. Conradine, the youngest son of Conrad, at the head of a body of troops, attempted to take control and his efforts were successful at first; but he was treacherously ambuscaded and captured, and given over to Charles of Anjou, Count of Provence, France, then ruling in Naples, by whom he was beheaded. The son of Manfred died in prison, as did other possible heirs to the throne. All the adherents of Conradine were treated with the greatest cruelty by Charles. This led to retaliation. John, of Procida, swore vengeance. By his influence all the French throughout the island of Sicily without regard to age or sex, to the number of 8,000, on Easter day, 1282, were massacred, the tolling of the bell for vespers being the signal. The island was then given over to Manfred's son-in-law, Peter of Aragon, who not only repelled all the attacks of Charles, but established an independent kingdom, the first king of Sicily being his son Frederick.

The cities of Italy were meanwhile ruling themselves without much regard to the Empire, while the great dukes and princes, bishops of Germany, through seizing one claim after another, were becoming as powerful as kings. Seven of these chiefs were competent to elect a king of Germany. They were the three grand chancellors, the Archbishops of

Mainz, Köln, and Trier, with the King of Bohemia, grand cup-bearer; the high steward, the Duke of Bavaria; the grand marshal, the Duke of Saxony; and the Pfalzgraf of the Rhine. These were the royal electors, and sat apart in the diet, making up a separate college.

The German cities, in the absence of an Emperor, had also become very strong. In 1241 a league was formed of the Hanse (Hanse, an alliance) towns, the most powerful commercial body ever known. Their fleets visited the Mediterranean, were capable of repelling pirates, and fought with the ships of the cities of Genoa, Pisa, and Venice. At first including only Lubeck and Hamburg, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the Hanseatic League embraced as many as seventy cities and controlled three hundred ships manned by 12,000 sailors. At the height of its prosperity, the League included: 1—The Wend towns of Lubeck, Hamburg, Bremen, Rostock, Keil, Griefswald, Stettin, and Wisby, etc. 2—Towns of Holland and Westphalia, Cologne being the principal city. 3—Saxon towns, Brunswick being chief, and including Magdeburg, Halle, Hanover, Erfurt, Brandenburg, Frankfort, Breslau, etc. 4—Eastern towns, including Thom, Königsberg, Riga, etc., under Dantzic. This League waged bloody wars with the Scandinavian countries and with England. Its chief executive, Alexander von Soltwedel, a citizen of Lubeck, sacked Copenhagen in 1249, and burned the Danish settlement of Stralsund. Toward the end of the century they blockaded and plundered the coasts of Norway, seized the fleet of King Eric, and compelled him through the Treaty of Calmar, 1285, to grant the League a commercial monopoly. They waged a bloody war with Denmark and Sweden in 1361, prevented the incorporation of Schleswig and Holstein with Denmark, and made the Danes consent not to choose a king without the

concurrence of the League. Queen Margaret of Sweden, was forced to place Stockholm in their hands for three years as a pledge that she would observe the treaty. Later they attempted to dethrone Gustavus Vasa of Sweden and subject Denmark completely, but failed in both projects.

Much of the activity of the Middle Ages was in relation to the waging of the Crusades, religious wars against the Turks, and later, in other directions. The spirit of chivalry, which began to develop during the ninth century and had received great impetus during the successive expeditions to the Holy Land, and instituted military orders, such as the Knights Templars, and the Knights of St. John, came to be extended in other directions and by various classes. Thus the Crusades, which had at first been preached against infidels, were later directed by one class of Christians against another class; and by Christians against heathens.

Thus Crusades were preached against the Counts of Toulouse and the Counts of Provence; and in Sicily they were preached against King Conrad, and later against Manfred, when, as already referred to, he was slain by the army of Charles, Count of Anjou, to whom Pope Urban the Fourth had offered the crown.

Nowhere did knight-errantry prevail more extensively, perhaps, than in Germany and there extensive Crusades were stirred up against the heathen of North Europe. Poland became Christian about the end of the tenth century, and its Dukes and Kings had much trouble with their pagan neighbors, including the Prussians, the Lithuanians, the Livonians, and the Esthonians—all of whom were idolatrous, and by whom Poland was cut off almost entirely from the Baltic.

In the reign of Frederick II, of Germany (1212-1250), there was established the order of Teutonic Knights, who at

first were invited to aid the Polish princes against the heathen Prussians; but later, under their Grand Master, Herman of Salza, were commissioned by the Emperor and Pope Gregory the Ninth—who preached a Crusade against Prussia—to conquer and settle that country. They carried out these instructions and another order of Knights arose in 1237, who joined the Teutonic Knights and established themselves in Livonia. The wars of these Knights were called Holy Wars, and fighting men of all nations joined their armies to fight against the heathens just as they had formerly joined to fight against the Turks. But according to history the Knights were often a greater menace to those whom they were supposed to help than they were to those whom they fought against.

The Hapsburg, or Hawk's Castle, built in the eleventh century, is still standing on a rocky bluff in the small canton of Aargau, Switzerland, which in the year 1232 was the baronial possession of Albert, fourth Count of Hapsburg. As the historian Abbott tells us: "Religious fanaticism and military ambition were then the two great powers which ruled the human soul;" and accordingly Albert, at the head of thirty steel-clad warriors, with nodding plumes and waving banners, amid the sounding of bugles and clatter of horse-hoofs, left his ancestral castle to go to the Holy Land and fight the Saracens, but never returned. He died at Askalon in 1240.

His oldest son, Rhodolph, or Rudolf, was twenty-two years of age at his father's death. As heir of the ancestral castle, surrounded as he was by barons of greater wealth and power, styled by certain historians "Robber Barons," Rudolf felt compelled to pursue the same course as others and increase his fortune by force of arms. He organized a military corps by which he extended his territory and some-

times extorted money. In 1245 he strengthened himself still more by marriage with Gertrude, the beautiful daughter of the Count of Hohenberg, receiving with his bride the Castle of Oeltingen and adjacent lands.

In 1253, Rudolf headed a band of steel-clad warriors in a midnight attack upon the city of Basle, in which foray a nunnery was set on fire. For this Rudolf was excommunicated by the Pope, a blow at that time from which even a king might not recover. To retrieve himself Rudolf plunged into a war against the barbarous Prussians, against whom the Pope had published a Crusade. This course soon changed the papal disposition toward Rudolf, and his excommunication seems to have been revoked; for he and the Pope were soon on good terms. Then he aided the city of Strasbourg in a war against their bishop and the city gave him an extensive territory and raised a monument to him by way of recompense. Rudolf also becoming guardian of his niece, only daughter of his younger brother, who died, he came thereby into possession of a large domain, including the counties of Kyburg, Leutzburg, and Baden.

His desire for control increased with his possessions. Though he would never stoop to ordinary robbery, as was the custom of the barons around him, and though he cleared the highways of the bandits that infested them, he did attack and capture various castles. He thus gained a wide reputation for justice as well as prowess; and the name of Rudolf of Hapsburg became greatly respected, because the sole idea of greatness which then dominated the world was military strength. He was chosen chief of the mountaineers of Uri, Schweitz and Underwalden; and made prefect of the City of Zurich; while the trained bands of the mountains and troops of the city were equally ready to do his bidding.

An alliance of barons was formed to crush him, but he overthrew the latter so quickly where their forces met in one of the valleys of Zurich, and took one strong castle after another so rapidly, that they declared him invincible. The haughty Bishop of Basle, whose palace and possessions were across the Rhine, and who controlled many barons, demanded the withdrawal and submission of Rudolf, not dreaming he would dare to cross the river. But, constructing a bridge of boats, Rudolf crossed the Rhine, put the troops of the Bishop to flight, and burned the grain in his fields. His Reverence humbly sued for peace, which Rudolf granted on terms satisfactory to himself and went into camp with his men.

That night he was awakened by a messenger, who informed him that he had been elected Emperor of Germany.

As neither Alphonso nor Ottocar would acknowledge Rudolf's election, the latter sent a messenger asking Pope Gregory's aid, who pledged his support. This silenced Alphonso, but not Ottocar, who would not even submit to an order of the Diet sitting at Augsburg, but insisted that "a man excommunicated for burning a convent was unfit for Emperor!"

Ottocar was veteran of many battles, and his possessions extended from the borders of Bavaria to Raab in Hungary, and from the Adriatic to the Baltic. The German barons were not inclined to be loyal to Rudolf, and his following as Count of Hapsburg was small. He secured the earnest support of the Duke of Slavonia by giving him one of his daughters in marriage; the Count of Tyrol's support was gained through the marriage of Rudolf's son Albert to his daughter Margaret; and by the marriage of his daughter Hedrige to Henry's son Otho he gained the active aid of Henry of Bavaria,—thus following the ancient royal custom

of putting one's large family to strategical and political, as well as military, uses.

Ottocar tried to save Vienna by a forced march through the Bohemian mountains, but Rudolf was there before him with his army, and the city capitulated (1273). Meanwhile the Pope had excommunicated Ottocar, who sued for peace. Ottocar was obliged to give up the provinces of Styria, Carinthia, Carniola and Windischmark, and take an oath of allegiance to the Emperor. Then Rudolf gave another daughter in marriage to a son of Ottocar. This oath of fealty was taken by Ottocar on the island of Lobau, in the Danube, in the presence of his own escort of Bohemian nobles and Rudolf's entire army November 26, 1276, after which the Pope withdrew his sentence of excommunication. But there was one factor Ottocar had not reckoned with—his wife, Cunegunda. By her taunts and reproaches she forced Ottocar to violate his oath, who refused to execute the treaty, imprisoned Rudolf's daughter in a convent, sent the Emperor an insulting letter, and made such extensive preparations for war that the citizens of Vienna, as well as Rudolf himself, became alarmed. Though Rudolf's forces were greatly outnumbered, their armies met on the plains of Murchfield, August 26, 1278, where a terrific battle ensued, in which Ottocar was slain. Cunegunda submitted, and her son, Prince Wenceslaus, married Rudolf's daughter Judith, while Rudolf's second son Rudolf married Cunegunda's daughter Agnes.

Rudolf had three sons and seven daughters, but one son was drowned and the second died in 1290, before his only child, Johann, was born. Rudolf, though he founded the House of Hapsburg in Austria, and though he was called Kaiser, was never crowned emperor of Rome. He tried to have this ceremony conferred upon his son Albert during

his own lifetime, but at the time of Rudolf's death, in July, 1291, this had not been done.

The electors made Adolphus of Nassau Rudolf's successor, and this led to a war and a great battle near Wirms in 1298, between him and Albert, where Adolphus was slain by Albert, who was then crowned king. Various wars occurred in his reign and the heroic acts of William Tell, the archer of Uri, are supposed to have happened when Albert's delegate, Gessler, was governor at Altdorf in Switzerland. Albert was assassinated by his nephew, Johann, in 1308.

At this time Philip of France had forced Pope Clement V to live at Avignon, and kept him practically under his control. At Philip's command, Clement ordered the German electors to choose Charles, Count of Valois, his own brother. But the electors refused, nor would they elect another of the Hapsburgs.

They chose Henry VII, who is said to have taken Charlemagne, Barbarossa and Frederick II for his models. He decided to free Italy from French rule, but was forced to first look after Bohemia, where Henry of Carinthia, elected King in defiance of the late Emperor Albert, had proved a cruel tyrant. Henry's son, John, a boy of fourteen, married Elizabeth, sister of Wenzel, the last King of Bohemia, and the people united to expel the Carinthian, while Henry crossed the Alps. This was in the year 1310, and the Ghibellines of Italy flocked to his standard, among them the poet, Dante, who celebrated Henry in his verse. Unfortunately, he went into winter quarters at Genoa in 1311, and Robert of Naples, taking advantage of his slowness, sent an army to Rome. Henry, with but two thousand men, marched against him and was defeated, and, while waiting

for reinforcements, was poisoned by a monk, and died suddenly August 24, 1313.

Five Ghibelline electors, with John of Luxemburg at their head, now chose Louis of Bavaria as king, while the Guelph electors chose Frederick the Fair, Duke of Austria. The contest was decided by the battle of Muhldorf, near Salzburg (1322), in favor of Louis. As the latter refused to appear before the Pope at Avignon, the whole German Empire was placed under an interdict. This caused Louis to proceed to Italy in 1327, where he assumed the iron crown at Milan, issued a ban against the King of Naples, and deposed the Pope, placing a Minorite monk in the papal chair as Nicholas V and having the latter crown him at Rome.

The Minorites, a branch of the Franciscans, supported Louis, but none of the other orders, and in Frankfort and other cities Louis deprived all the clergy who refused to support him of their cures. The deposed Pope retaliated by excommunicating Louis.

This did not deter Louis from holding a great diet at Reuse, on the Rhine, where the assembled princes declared the Roman emperor to be the highest power on earth, and to be rightly chosen by the electors of Germany. Louis then, as spiritual head, dissolved the marriage of Margaret Maultasche (wide-mouth), heiress of the Tyrol, with the son of King John of Bohemia, and married her to his second son Louis. He also made another son Count of Holland.

Louis was the last emperor to suffer excommunication, and in his case the influence of Philip of France and Pope John XXII, was potent enough to cause Charles, son of the King of Bohemia, to be elected in his place; shortly afterwards Louis died when on a bear hunt.

The King of France and the Pope now assumed control over the new Emperor of Germany. But as a warrior the

latter did not prove very heroic. At the battle of Crecy (1346) he was the first to flee, while his blind old father, King John, spurred his horse into the thickest of the fight and was slain. Edward, the Black Prince, captured his shield with its motto, "Ich dien" (I serve), and this has been the motto of the Prince of Wales ever since.

The Roman people, in the absence of the Pope at Avignon, rose against the nobility and established a republic, of which Cola di Rienzi was elected as Tribune. Charles, in his visit to Rome, instead of approving of this liberal movement, as Rienzi expected, seized him and gave him over to the Pope.

Charles is chiefly remembered from his "golden bull," fixing the number of German electors at seven, three spiritual—Mayence, Cologne and Trier—and four temporal—Bohemia, Brandenburg, Saxe Wittenberg and the Palatinate of the Rhine.

The son of Charles, Wenceslaus, during his reign (1378-1400), took no heed of Italian affairs or Germany's either, but kept always in Bohemia. He was a drunkard and a cunning lunatic, who committed many murders on slight provocation. Count Robert, or Reupert, of the Palatinate, did little to redeem the royal authority during his reign (1400-1410). An attempt he made in conjunction with Leopold II, King of Austria, to force his way through Italy to Rome, resulted in a defeat of their armies at Brescia, Leopold being taken prisoner. Robert returned to the Palatinate and died in 1411. This Leopold was the second son of Leopold I of Austria, who fought the Swiss League at Sempach, July 9, 1396, and was defeated in the battle in which Arnold of Winkelried heroically threw himself against the bristling spears and perished.

Sigismund, chosen king in 1410, was crowned emperor in 1433. At that time he was Margrave of Brandenburg and

King of Hungary, and later became King of Bohemia. During his reign the Hussite wars occurred, John Huss and Jerome of Prague being burned alive at the stake (1436).

With the election of Albert II of Austria, Sigismund's son-in-law (1438-39), the Hapsburg line secured the imperial throne again. Albert died the next year and another Austrian prince, Frederick, Duke of Styria, was elected. He was the last monarch to be crowned emperor at Rome, an event which occurred in 1452. From the time of Sigismund, when the connection between the empire and Hungary began, Germany took on a new character. Only princes of acknowledged power were now elected, and always from the House of Austria.

The Italian cities, over which the empire was supposed to dominate, were coming into prominence, and the political influence of the Popes had to be reckoned with. Milan, Venice, Pisa, Florence, Genoa and other towns had reigning dukes and governments of their own, and sometimes, as in ancient Greece, one city controlled another.

Though the Council of Constance had declared itself superior to the Popes, this was not conceded by all authorities, and the papal influence is regarded as having been quite as potent in temporal affairs as the spiritual. Says Freeman: "We may look on the Popes as undoubted temporal princes of Rome. They were gradually able to bring under their power all that part of Italy, stretching from one sea to the other, over which they professed to have rights by the grants of various kings and emperors. The later Popes of the fifteenth century must be looked on as little more than Italian princes, and many of them were among the very worst of the Italian princes. Some of them, like Nicholas V, did some good by way of encouraging learning, and Pius II, who reigned from 1458 to 1464, and who is famous as a writer

by his former name of Aenas Silvius, tried, like Gregory X, to get the Christian princes to join in a crusade for the deliverance of the East. But Sixtus V and Innocent VIII were among the worst of the Popes, thinking of nothing except increasing their temporal power and advancing their own families."

About this time the Turks were becoming the terror of Christendom. They had overrun Asia Minor, crossed the Hellespont and established themselves firmly in Europe, gaining possession of Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia and portions of Hungary. Ladislaus IV, King of Hungary, was killed in an attempt to repel them in 1440. They occupied Adrianople in 1361, under the leadership of their Sultan, Amurath, and made it the Ottoman capital. Their successes were in a measure due to their custom of capturing Christian children and bringing them up as soldiers, called Janissaries (new soldiers). They were so well trained as to overcome all enemies, and it was largely due to the invasion of another branch of Mohammedans, the followers of Timour, that Europe was relieved of the terror inspired by the chief of the Ottoman Turks known as Bojazet the Thunderbolt, who became their leader in 1389. In 1402 Timour encountered the forces of Bajazet in a fierce battle at Angora and took him prisoner, thus giving eastern Europe a breathing spell.

May 29, 1453, Constantinople, capital of the Roman Empire of the East, which had really been Greek since 1260, when it was recovered from the Latins by Michael Paleologus, first of the Greek emperors, was taken by the Turks under Mahomet II, their first emperor.

Three bands of Turks, of 10,000 each, overran now the states bordering on Hungary and penetrated into Illyria as far as the city of Laybach. They burned every village and slew the inhabitants. Frederick the emperor, seemed indif-

ferent to the danger, but the barons of Carniola gathered an army of 20,000 men and drove the Turks back to the Bosphorus. The Turks had slain, however, 6,000 Christians and taken away 8,000 as captives. A few years later a larger army of Turks poured through the defiles of the Illyrian mountains like a volcanic fire, and dragged away with them 20,000 captives, and these incursions were continued.

The accession of Maximilian I, son of Frederick, in 1493, marks a period characterized by at least two tendencies—one toward national unity among the people, and another toward the reformation of practical abuses in the church. The empire was divided into ten circles, each forming a union. These included Austria, Bavaria, Franconia, Swabia, Upper Rhine, Electoral Rhine, Burgundy, Westphalia and Upper and Lower Saxony. In this division, Bohemia, Silesia, Moravia, Lusatia and Prussia were not included.

A struggle with France for the possession of Upper Italy began. Louis XII of France proposed to Pope Alexander VI to give his son, Caesar Borgia, a pension of \$2,000 a year if the Pope would assist him in getting control of the Italian cities; he also made specious promises to each city. An army of 22,000 crossed the Alps in 1499, and, after a few successful conflicts, captured Milan. Maximilian promised aid, but could raise neither money nor men. Duke Ludovico, who had escaped from Milan, succeeded in hiring an army of 10,000 Burgundians and Swiss, with which he drove Louis and his followers out of Milan and recovered every fortress but one, that of Novarra, held by the Chevalier de Bayard. And it should be noted that in that period men of all ranks were ready to be hired as fighting men in almost any cause.

The marriage of Maximilian's son Charles with Joanna of Spain brought that kingdom under the Hapsburg line in the person of the emperor's grandson, Charles I of Spain, elected

Emperor of Germany in 1519 with the name Charles V. His military record includes his refusal to arrest Luther at Pope Leo X's demand (1520), his first war with France in 1521, and his second war with France in 1527, in which the German army took Rome and burned a part of the city; a third French war in 1532, and a fourth French war in 1542. In 1535 Charles led an attack of 30,000 men against the Turks in Tunis and liberated 22,000 Christians who had been languishing in dungeons. He also, with the assistance of Alva, defeated the Protestants at the battle of Muhlberg (1547).

It was the danger he incurred from the side of the French and of the Turks that served to allay and defer the action of Charles against the Protestant princes of Germany. From 1531 to 1541 the Schmaldaldic League of Protestant Princes possessed control in German affairs, and not till 1546 did Charles find time to turn upon them and break the power of the League, as he did at Muhlberg, where the leaders, John Frederick of Saxony, and Philip Landgrave of Hesse, were made prisoners. It was in 1550 that Charles convoked a commission at Valladolid, Spain, to consider a question raised by the theologians, whether war was necessary to a saving knowledge of Christ.

During the reign of Charles' brother, Ferdinand I, and the latter's son, Maximilian II (1556-1576), Germany enjoyed a period comparatively peaceful, though the Netherlands were being drenched with blood, a happening attributed largely to Charles' son, Philip II of Spain. Maximilian was elected King of Poland in 1575, and died not long after, some attributing his demise to poison.

In 1571 occurred the naval battle of Lepanto, with the Turks, in which the combined fleets of Spain, Venice and

Pius V, under the command of Don John of Austria, practically destroyed the maritime power of the Turks.

During the reign of Rudolf II (1576-1612) the Jesuits were in control and the Catholic League founded. His successor, Mathias (1612-19), was also guided largely by the same influences, and the election of his cousin, Ferdinand, intensely anti-Protestant, in 1617, was the signal for the beginning of the bloody "Thirty Years' War," which depopulated parts of Germany, prostrated its industries, and reduced it to a condition of almost primitive barbarism.

The battle of Prague in 1620 between the Imperialists and the Bohemians, in which the latter were defeated and their king, Frederick V, compelled to flee to Holland, ruined the Protestant cause in Bohemia. Other famous battles of this war include that of Wiesloch, fought in April, 1622, where Earnest Von Mansfeld defeated Count de Tilly, German military commander; the victory of Tilly (1626) over Christian IV of Denmark, at Lutter; the surrender of Pomerania to Gustavus Adolphus, 1630; the battle of Lutzen or Lippstads, already referred to (1632); the victories of Bernhard over the Imperialists at Rheinfeld (1638) and the capture of Altbreisach (1639); the capture of Arras, Spain (1640); Count of Harcourt's victories in Italy (1640-42); the bloody battle of Nordlingen (1645), in which Mercy was killed, and where the Duke of Enghien put to rout the entire imperial army; the defeat of Leopold at Sens, in Artois, by Conde (1648); victories of Turenne and the Swedes at Lauingen and Zusmarshausen (1648), and the taking of Prague by the Swedish general Konigsmark (1648). It is estimated that one-half the population of Germany perished during this war. Augsburg was reduced from 80,000 to 18,000 people; Saxony lost 900,000 men in two years, and other sections suffered in like ratio.

During the reigns of Leopold I (1658-1705), Joseph I (1705-11), and Charles VI (1711-40), the aggressions of Louis XIV had to be continually opposed by the empire. Louis' gold had its influence in the taking over of Strasburg by the French in 1680 and the adding of Luxemburg by the settlement with Leopold. Leopold's cruelty as well as weakness was shown later when he put to death a large number of Hungarian nobles for conspiracy and sold 250 Lutheran ministers as galley slaves on a similar charge. The people rebelled and unwisely invoked the assistance of the Turks, who entered Hungary with 280,000 men under Kara Mustapha. They advanced to Vienna, but were checked by a small army of Hungarians under Tekeli. After two months Count Stabrenberg, the commandant, after sending up rockets for three days to signal his distress, was on the point of surrendering, when the Polish king, John Sobuiski, arrived with his army and drove the Turks away.

Leopold did not welcome Sobuiski, and put hundreds of the Hungarians to death. Meanwhile the army of Louis XIV, sent into the Palatinate to secure that territory for France, was treating the inhabitants there with no less cruelty. Under General Melac, Worms, Mannheim, Oppenheim, Baden and other towns were burnt and citizens treated with merciless brutality.

The intrigues of France and French agents at this time created such alarm in Germany that a diet was held at Ratisbon to prohibit intercourse with France, and an alliance was formed with England and Spain against that nation. In 1692, William III of England, in command of the forces of the allies, was defeated at Steinkirk, though he managed to conduct a masterly retreat, and the French blew up the Castle of Heidelberg by way of revenge. The treaty of Ryswyck gave France all its German holdings, except Lorraine, the

Palatinate, and Philipsburg. In the war of the Spanish Succession (1401-14) the German states came into conflict with each other. The electors of Cologne and Bavaria sided with the Pope, and the Dukes of Saxony and Mantau, in favor of Louis' candidate, Philip of Anjou; Hanover, having been granted an electoral hat, firmly supported Austria's heir; Saxony, though favorable to the emperor, was occupied in a struggle with the Poles, and Ferdinand III of Brandenburg supported Austria, because of having been granted the title of the "King of Prussia."

The first account that we have of the Hohenzollerns, is to the effect that they occupied a castle on the hill of Zollern, in Wurtemberg, and the first mention of their name is in the closing years of the eleventh century. "Hohen" means "high," and "Zollern" mean "taxes." The Hohenzollerns belonged to the class of petty independent or quasi independent princes who swarmed in Germany at this period, acknowledging no superiors and who did what seemed good in their own eyes. The principal sources of revenue for these robber barons was the plunder of traveling merchants and traders who were unfortunate enough to fall into their hands.

The family comes into prominence in 1415, when Frederick of Nuremburg secured by purchase from Sigismund, Emperor of Germany, the territory of Brandenburg and became Margrave of Brandenburg and elector of the empire, as Frederick I. His dominion consisted of 10,000 square miles of sandy plain interspersed with fertile districts. It was popularly described as "the sand box of the Holy Roman Empire." The population was originally sear and rather scanty.

Frederick Wilhelm, or "The Great Elector," succeeded in 1640. His political and military genius made him an exception to the reigning sovereigns of his time. He was suc-

cessful in war, in peace and in intrigue. His territory and influence were largely augmented by the treaty of Westphalia, 1648, at the close of the 'Thirty Years' War. It was the energy and sagacity of the great elector which laid the foundation of what afterwards became the kingdom of Prussia. He owed his success to the almost exclusive personal care and attention which he paid to his little army. Ever since his day it has been the tradition of the Hohenzollerns to give to the army the first consideration. At the death of the great elector, Brandenburg was inferior to Austria alone among the states of the empire. From 1640 to 1688 its area increased to 40,000 square miles, its revenue multiplied seven-fold, and its small army was unsurpassed for efficiency. Frederick found Brandenburg a constitutional state where the legislative power was shared by the Diet with the Elector. He left it to his successor substantially an absolute monarchy and such Prussia has ever since remained.

In 1701 Frederick III, son of the Great Elector, put a crown on his own head, and Brandenburg became king "*in Prussia*," as Frederick I.

He crowned himself because the territory in which he was recognized as king did not lie within the bounds of the Holy Roman Empire. Prussia bordered on Russia and from henceforward there has been mutual jealousy and distrust between Prussia and Russia.

To the above-mentioned king succeeded (1713) Frederick Wilhelm I, famed in story for his vulgarity and brutality, the father of Frederick the Great. But Frederick William possessed executive ability of a high order. He hoarded money and had a well filled treasury. As a Hohenzollern, his first care was his army. He employed every available plan he could conceive of to increase its efficiency. He was the first to employ iron ramrods for his muskets, and Prussia has

ever since been on the lookout for improvements in arms which would make her superior to all her rivals. Frederick William I, by husbanding his finances and applying them to military purposes, was able to keep on foot one of the largest and best trained armies in Europe. It was a veritable "war machine." He was an absolute monarch, and his ministers were rather clerks for registering his decrees. What was known as civil liberty in England was not dreamed of in Prussia. Frederick William conquered Pomerania, and, Sweden disappearing from the ranks of the Great Powers, Prussia was left without a rival in northern Germany.

During his reign the revenues of Prussia were doubled and he left a treasury of 9,000,000 thalers and an army of 85,000 men. Though only the twelfth of European states in extent of territory and population, Prussia ranked fourth in military power. The army was the all in all, and its discipline was of the strictest. The maxims of the king were money for the army, the army for conquest, conquest for expansion, expansion for more money for a greater army, for still further expansion.

These principles of policy were inherited by his son, Frederick the Great, and have ever since directed the efforts of the house of Hohenzollern. Industry and commerce were for the most part left to take care of themselves or made subsidiary to military purposes. With the same end in view, science has been cultivated. Frederick the Great despised German literature and surrounded himself with French savants. German literature and philosophy grew up entirely independent of royal assistance. Kant was silenced and Fichte, who was expelled from his chair for his democratic learning, was called to Berlin when his help was needed to serve the German people against Napoleon. Hegel was

called to Berlin because he was an absolutist in politics and became a moral police scavenger for the reaction.

When the Seven Years' War broke out, in 1756, Frederick had an army of 150,000 men and a portion of eleven million thalers. Of the 850,000 soldiers who perished in this war about 180,000 fell while in the service of Prussia. The Hohenzollerns have been lavish of the blood of their subjects. Prussia emerged from this conflict a first-class military power. But the gross population had decreased to the extent of half a million souls and the misery and poverty of the people were almost incalculable.

While it is not to be denied that Frederick did many things to improve the condition of his people, it remains true that the old system of rigid social privilege was still maintained and impassable barriers divided the noble from the citizen and the citizen from the peasant. And the same relation still exists between the Prussian *Junker* and the bourgeoisie. The government was a personal despotism. Breslau was ceded to Prussia in 1741, Silesia and Glatz added in 1742, and in 1772 Frederick shared in the crime of the division of Poland, which had the effect of doubling the area of Prussia. He died in 1786, having increased his territory to 75,000 square miles, with an annual revenue of 20,000,000 thalers, and a population of five and a half millions.

After the settlement in 1815 Prussia played a secondary role in foreign politics until Bismarck came to the helm in 1862. The victory of Prussia over Austria in 1866, and the incorporation of Schleswig-Holstein to its own territory, left Prussia the undisputed mistress of Germany. In 1871, as a result of the victory of Germany over France, the King of Prussia became German Emperor.



KAISER WILHELM
EMPEROR OF GERMANY

CHAPTER VIII.

CAUSES OF THIS WAR

We have completed our survey of the developments in Europe as reflected particularly in the military operations of the six war centers; namely, the Grecian peninsula, the Italian peninsula, and the Roman Empire, the Franco-Iberian peninsula, the British Isles and the Scandinavian peninsula, Russia, and Germany. We have considered the events in these countries mostly as they took place from the earliest epochs in history to the period as late as the beginning of the twentieth century. We have been confronted with a chain of wars succeeding each other in almost dazzling frequency; we have found countries at war with each other and at war with themselves. States like the Roman Empire have developed through inherent prowess and conquest of other races and states, and have died through internal weakening and foreign invasion. The circle of events in the history of the states seems almost determined; on the one hand, increase and expansion through force of innate vitality and consequent domination of portions of the outside world, and on the other, weakening, shrinkage and death, through internal corruption and consequent defeat at the hands of the aggressor from the outside. In other words, states have tended to realize their potency and creative

energy in terms of warfare and domination of fellow states, and as a result, have been compelled to yield, in their turn, to foreign dominion, when their own vital stock began to suffer depletion. Athens grew and, while growing, swallowed up other Greek principalities; but Athens began to grow feeble, and, in proportion to the loss of her strength, was encroached upon and conquered by new aggressors. The nature of the conclusion therefore shows the path of the movement, at the start as well as during the whole course, to have been crooked, and if nations desire to live without having to suffer at the hands of superior neighbors, they should give expression to their inner forces through channels other than those of aggression, violent conquest, and, in general, warfare. Nations should discover channels carrying the current in both directions, so to speak, and to the enrichment of all the parties concerned, and should engage in forms of relationship which are symmetrical, as in the case of trading, where the benefit of the customer does not exclude the benefit of the salesman. But we are anticipating ourselves, and these reflections properly find their place in the concluding chapter.

Here we may notice that time does not seem to have effected any change in the points of view adopted by national governments, and that warfare is a symptom of the working of the life of peoples *now*, just as it has been in more ancient times. As an overwhelming evidence of this fact, we have the Great European War which has burst into the world-stage with the suddenness of a volcanic eruption, and has extended its hold upon the larger part of the continent with the speed of lightning. There is no doubt that the present war is the greatest, most violent, and most far-reaching in influence of all conflicts in history, but it is yet going on, and therefore, in this book, cannot be treated with any ade-

quacy. Only after the war is finished shall we be enabled to see it in the proper perspective. But, because of its immense importance, the war cannot be simply passed over. Hence we will endeavor to present the reader with a picture of the events and processes which have anteceded the war, and point out their causal connection with the outbreak of the conflict.

The causal antecedents of the Great War may be divided into two; on the one hand, general and more distant, and on the other, immediate and particular. Under the latter head come, of course, the assassination of the Austrian heir to the throne and such matter as the diplomatic negotiations which took place just before the war was declared. But the more general antecedents are also the more significant, and it is these which should engage our attention primarily. Under the latter heading we will include the following five factors: Franco-German rivalry, Anglo-German rivalry, Slav-Teuton rivalry, the growth of the German Empire, and the Near Eastern question. Let us treat them in the order as mentioned.

(a) The Franco-German rivalry, so far as we are concerned in this chapter, reduces itself to the bad feeling started between the two countries by the cession of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany at the conclusion of the war of 1870. Germany was then completely victorious over France and practically dictated her own terms. Besides exacting an indemnity of a billion francs, she secured for herself possession of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. While the war was being waged Bismarck had declared that Metz and Strassburg were necessary for the securing of a defensive frontier for Germany, and first he insisted upon taking Belfort as well, but M. Thiers, on behalf of the French government, made passionate endeavors to keep the fortress in the possession

of France. Bismarck, it appears, was moved and he yielded, and France paid the indemnity with less pain, because she knew Belfort had been saved. But Alsace and Lorraine were bound to go, and France yielded, despite the vehement protests of the inhabitants of the provinces themselves.

Now, since then, the fact of the incorporation of the said provinces into the German Empire has been an extremely potent source of ill-will and even hatred on the part of France toward Germany. Bismarck claimed that the annexation was necessary to the ends of peace, but history has falsified, signally, the claim. The events have taught very clearly that any peace which is secured at the price of the denial of the right of nationality, serves but as a breathing spell for new wars. To be sure, if we except Metz, Alsace-Lorraine did belong at some ancient time to Germany, and it was only later acquired by Louis XIV. But the prime question as to nationality is the question of the consciousness and sentiment of the people. The inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine were French in sentiment and in loyalty, and they have kept so through the period of German domination. They possessed a national self, and that self was French in soul and heart. These sentiments of patriotism to France have been but solidified through the contribution in terms of blood which the provinces made to France during the times of the Revolution and the Napoleonic wars.

In fact, it is credibly reported that Bismarck himself felt qualms of conscience about the wisdom of the annexation, but that his fears were overruled by Moltke, who claimed that the provinces possessed immense military value for Germany. However that may be, it is a fact that since those days the French people have felt an ineradicable hatred for, and fear of, the power of Germany, and within their hearts has rankled deep the intense longing for the day of the

“revanche”—the day when Germany would be brought to account. Since 1870 the military policy of France has been largely determined with the view of rendering the country strong enough to take back her own unto herself.

Then started a race in military equipment between France and Germany. In 1886 the peace footing of the French army was raised to 500,000. At that time, that of Germany was 427,000, and she accordingly increased it by the addition of 41,000. In 1899 the German peace strength was raised to 495,000, and in 1905 to 505,000. In 1912 an Army Bill was introduced into the Reichstag providing for further addition, and in 1913 another Army Act was passed providing for the raising of the peace strength by installments to 870,000. Germany justified these measures by citing the fact that owing to Turkey's defeat by the Balkans, she had lost a possible ally, and that for the same reason Austria would be compelled to station a much larger army on her Balkan frontier to defend against a bigger Serbia, so that Germany could rely on her ally far less than she did before. She also pointed out the fact that Russia, by increasing her military equipment, became a more formidable rival than ever. France, in reply to the German measures, lowered the age-limit for the beginning of service from 21 to 20 and extended the term of service from two to three years.

Meanwhile, the Germans have pursued an extremely drastic and uncompromising policy toward the annexed provinces, with the result that the attitude of resistance on the part of the inhabitants toward the new government, instead of abating in force, has, on the contrary, been intensified. The Germans adopted a policy which aimed to denationalize the inhabitants, and their ways have been the ways of violence. The recent Zabern affair was a typical symptom of this state of affairs. Naturally, by way of re-

action, the people of the provinces hardened their hearts more against their rulers, and things have gone from bad to worse. Let it be noted that this situation has had its effect upon French opinion. The people in France, upon witnessing the brutal treatment meted out to their late countrymen, suffered keenly and sharpened their weapons more hurriedly for the day of opportunity. France wanted to be strong in her competition with Germany, and so she gravitated, during the years 1891-6, toward Russia, with whom she formally concluded a treaty of alliance. And now the war is being waged in Flanders, in the annexed provinces and in Poland, and the French are everywhere proclaiming that the basal condition for the conclusion of peace will be the liberation of Alsace-Lorraine from the German yoke.

(b) We secondly take up the question of Anglo-German rivalry. This has in the first place expressed itself in the German desire for colonial expansion. Let us note that the colonial ambitions of Germany are of quite recent origin and growth. It was the opinion of Bismarck that colonies tended to weaken the forces of the national state, in compelling her to turn her attention to outside fields where she would be drawn into quarrels with other states similarly clamoring for possession. Bismarck, on the other hand, encouraged France into embarking on colonial conquests, because he was of the opinion that thereby France would be involved in troubles with other countries. But, later, Bismarck changed front, and since then Germany has been persistent in seeking a colonial dominion. Especially when the Empire assumed a protectionist regime, in 1879, over-production resulted, and the business people began to clamor frantically for foreign markets. But wherever Germany might turn her eyes she found herself anticipated in the

game by other states—by France, and especially England. Germany felt that she could not put forth the foot of conquest without brushing upon some British possession sedulously guarded by the British navy. And Germany has resented the fact that her aggressive movements have been automatically blocked by England, and thus has felt ill toward her.

Nevertheless, Germany has to some extent been successful in her schemes of colonial expansion, and her progress has on the other hand bred suspicion in the breast of the British. Putting the events in their chronological order, we may mention that Germany was allowed to possess territory for the first time in Africa in 1885; she acquired colonies in the Cameroons; from 1884 to 1885 she was occupying German New Guinea, and from 1886 to 1890 she was engaged in taking possession of what is known as German East Africa. In 1897 she acquired Kiao-Chau, in China, and England, not to be outdone, occupied the port of Wei-ha-wei. During the South African war the Kaiser sent his famous congratulatory telegram to Kruger (1896)—an incident which caused much resentment in England. Later, when the Germans sent the "Panther" to Agadir, thus ostentatiously proclaiming that France should take Germany's wishes into account as concerns the occupation of African territory, Lloyd George, the British cabinet minister, made a speech declaring that Britain would stand by France and help her, if necessary, by drawing the sword. Correspondingly, this incident provoked much resentment among the Germans.

In the meantime, Germany began to court Turkey, the Kaiser visiting the Sultan and proclaiming himself the protector of Mohammedans, a role which Britain has claimed for herself heretofore. In 1898 the Kaiser visited Jeru-

salem, and in 1902 the construction of the Bagdad railway was authorized by the Sublime Porte—an event which has been viewed with growing concern and suspicion on the part of British statesmen. The ascendancy of Germany in Turkey has provoked a feeling of rivalry on the part of the British as well as of the French. Thus, in general, the race for colonial possessions has tended to put England and Germany at odds with each other, Germany claiming that England has completely blocked the way to her realization of legitimate and necessary expansion through colonial acquisition, and England, on her side, fearing that Germany is striving to grow in order to strike at her successfully, later.

Parallel with this process has been that of the industrial expansion of Germany. England and Germany have been the foremost states in industrial production, on the continent, and the competition between them for the acquisition of markets has been acute. Since 1879 German industrial progress has been very rapid, and in many respects has tended to supplant the produce of English origin, in the universal market. Germany's industrial growth has reinforced her demand for colonial expansion and for the discovery of markets for her wares, and both movements together have been the fundamental reason (according to German apologists) for her urgent call for an enlarged navy. After all, the race for the development of navies has been the chief factor in Anglo-German rivalry, the factor which has made Britain extremely suspicious of Germany and fearful of loss of her dominion, nay, of her very existence. Germany, on her side, has insisted that the navy has been a necessity to her side, for the purposes of securing colonies and protecting them, on the one hand, and of safeguarding her foreign trade, namely, the trade of her industries, on

the other. But England has refused to accept the explanation as sufficient and in the increase of the German navy has claimed to perceive a menace to the integrity of her possessions. Such words as those of the Kaiser: "Our future lies upon the sea," certainly did not tend to allay the mutual feeling of suspicion. In 1898 the first German Navy law appeared, and since then other modifications have been made in the German naval programme with the end of accelerating the building of warships. But England laid down the "two keels to one" programme and later adopted as her standard the principle that her navy should be superior by sixty per cent to that of any other power; by strict adherence to the above she has not let Germany make any real headway in the race. Churchill's proposal for a naval holiday was deemed unacceptable by the German Imperial Chancellor, and so the race has proceeded at full pace and with no interruption, the Navy League in Germany urging all the while more speed and arousing enthusiasm in the movement. The rivalry has therefore become more and more acute, until it now approaches the breaking point of endurance, and, proportionally, the feeling between the two states has assumed a more violently belligerent character.

(c) Thirdly, we take up Slav-Teuton rivalry. It may be remembered that at the outbreak of this war, German apologists gave as the supreme justification of their country's entrance into the war the danger from encroachment by the Russian Bear. They professed to discern in Slavism the future terrible foe of Teuton Kultur,—and the branding of England as the great enemy of Germany is more of an afterthought in the minds of our apologists. Now, this state of affairs is really not very old in origin. During the Franco-German war of 1870 Russia did nothing to help France and assumed the attitude of benevolent neutrality

toward Germany. Bismarck was instrumental in the formation of the Three Emperors' League, of which Germany, Austria, and Russia were the members. But Russia was decidedly lukewarm when in 1875 the Prussian war party prepared to pounce upon France in order to inflict upon her a second defeat; in fact, Russia interfered in favor of France. This served to cool German feeling toward Russia, and in the Berlin Congress Bismarck championed the proposal that the San Stephano treaty should be annulled, and was thus instrumental in depriving Russia of the spoils of her victory over Turkey. This Russia did not forget, and since then Slavs and Teutons have drifted farther apart. With respect to the Near East, it has been Germany's aim to develop a Turkey strong enough to offset the Russian impetus to expansion toward the south. Furthermore, the Austro-German alliance has schemed and intrigued in the Balkans with the end of frustrating all plans of Russia to secure a dominating position among her Balkan neighbors.

On the other hand, Russia has aimed so to increase her influence among the Balkan states as to direct the latter to resist Teuton aggression. Both parties have encouraged the formation of a Balkan confederation whose policy it would be to oppose either one of them. When, in 1908, Austria formally annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia found herself almost choked, Russia protested against the coup, but Germany at once confronted Russia in "shining armor"—in the words of the Kaiser—and Russia had to withdraw the protest. But Russia scored a point when, in 1912, a Balkan League was formed to a great extent under her protection and with her advice,—with the Teuton Allies kept completely in the dark about the matter. Nevertheless, at the close of the first Balkan war, when the influence of Russia seemed supreme, Austria persuaded King Ferdinand

of Bulgaria to oppose Serbia's claims of compensation in Macedonia and caused the outbreak of the second Balkan war, with the result of the dissolution of the Balkan League and the giving again to the Teutons of the preponderance of influence in the Balkans. Indeed, if Dr. Dillon (see his work "The Scrap of Paper") is to be credited, the present war originated from incidents of the Teuton-Slav rivalry upon the field of the Balkans; thus, according to Dr. Dillon, Austria's intention in sending the well-known ultimatum to Serbia in the middle of 1914 was to provoke a war by which to crush Serbia, thus to diminish Russia's prestige in the Balkans (since Serbia was a protege of Russia) and to succeed in compelling the rest of the Balkan States to form a coalition for the purpose of resisting the encroachments of Russia.

(d) Fourthly, we may notice German aggressiveness as such. The victory of the Germans over the French in 1870, and the crowning of the Prussian king as Emperor in Paris, gave the Germans a vast impetus to growth in every respect. Germany has been making enormous progress so far as the amount of her population is concerned. We append the following figures as to her population (taken from Rose's "The Origin of the War," p. 48):

1871.....	41,400,000	of inhabitants
1890.....	49,714,000	" "
1900.....	56,000,000	" "
1913.....	66,000,000	" "

The increase in population has been accompanied by a tremendous outburst of vital energy, which Germany has used efficiently in the development of her internal resources both in agriculture and in industry. What is much more important, all these movements have tended to produce in the German people an intensely violent, even chauvinistic,

national consciousness. Germany suddenly felt that she had been divinely appointed to perform a great task in the world, that she was entrusted with the mission of civilizing the world by implanting her own Kultur in the hearts of all the peoples. And so was evolved German "welt-politik," or world-policy, pointing to the establishment of a world-empire with Germany at the head. The symptoms of this tendency appear first in the movement toward expansion—which we have already noted—by the acquisition of colonies. Germany's population overflowed her borders and she looked for further land to occupy. She turned to China and occupied Kiao-Chau; then she turned to South America and sent a large number of immigrants to Brazil; but, owing to the Monroe doctrine, she has been unable to convert the commercial penetration into political possession. At the same time, she turned in the direction of Africa, and her movements there brought her into conflict repeatedly with France, and, indirectly, with England. When Russia became weakened by defeat at the hands of Japan Germany raised at once the question of the distribution of North African territory and effected the convening of the Algeciras Conference in 1906. But her bluff failed and she had to yield to compromise. When, in 1911, another conference was called at the instigation of Germany for the same purpose, the latter was again foiled, owing chiefly to the firm stand taken by England in support of France.

Another symptom of the current of German world-policy has been the Pan-German movement, aiming at the "revival of German national sentiment all over the earth," and to the union of all the people speaking the German language. The effect of the realization of this programme would be to enlarge the German Empire at the expense of Austria and Russia. But the supreme expression of "welt-politik" has

been the spirit of *militarism* which has dominated the hearts of the Germans, both of the masses and of the personnel of the administration. Heart and soul, the Germans have given themselves over to the development of an immense military force both on land and on sea, whose end it is to render Germany supreme on the continent and, indeed, in the whole world. As we have seen, the Reichstag has voted on repeated occasions to increase the personnel of the standing army, and, moreover, all the resources of the country, scientific, technical, and industrial, have been devoted to the creation of the completest possible equipments in shape of arms, ammunition, aerial fleet, etc. No wonder that the rest of the European states became alarmed and began to arm in defense. In Germany the military party became supreme, and the Navy league raised the cry of naval preponderance. The forces of militarism in general became the dominant expression of the German spirit and the scientific leaders of Germany have indeed declared that militarism furnishes the chief bulwark of the culture of their fatherland. To a large extent, the present war is due to the extremely aggressive tactics of the German war-party, which, thirsting for glory, and aiming to exalt Germany at the expense of the honor and territorial integrity of the other states, hurried matters in the fateful days of July and August (1914), and precipitated the conflict.

To the above let us add that this particular direction of Germany's world-policy is due to the influence of her universities and the counsel of her professors and, particularly, her philosophers. Nietzsche proclaimed in loud voice the independence of interest and expediency from moral considerations, and asserted that the achievement of power and domination is the supreme end of life—ranking higher even than the ends of happiness and virtue; that the state is not

answerable to the demand of individual conscience, and that it may exact unconditional obedience from its members, asserting at the same time (as Hegel also did before him) that the state is destined to receive its embodiment pre-eminently in the establishment of the German Empire; therefore the latter is enjoined to strain its energies to the end of securing domination over the rest of the nations. The German people fell in love, as it were, with their own Kultur, and undertook to propagate it and even compel the other nations by force to adopt it. But, humanly speaking, no state has the right to force itself or its goods upon other states, and the attitude of the German mind, as just expounded, has provoked estrangement between Germany, on the one hand, and most of the other powers in Europe, on the other; has made Germany more violently aggressive in her methods, and has inspired the other European states with the feelings of apprehension and resentment.

(e) Fifthly, we will consider the situation as created by the exigencies of the Oriental question. The Near East has served without interruption during the last half century as a hotbed of trouble for Europe. From the beginning, the entrance of Turkey into Europe seems to have been a great mistake. Turkey knew only how to conquer, but not how to govern, and there were continually complaints and insurrections on the part of her subject peoples. The Oriental question has been created by Turkey's assuming control over European peoples and owing to her incompetence to control them. Continually molested and pricked by rebellions and revolutions within her dominion, Turkey has long since entered into the bedroom as the "sick man of Europe," there to await death from day to day. In the meantime, the European states began to quarrel among themselves as to the inheritance. In fact, they set about seizing the goods



KING PETER
OF SERBIA

before their possessor had died, and then they had differences as to the apportionment of the goods. The Oriental question has consisted in the problem, (a) of dividing fairly the possessions of Turkey among the European powers, and (b) of giving to the subject races (Greek, Bulgarian, Serbian and Montenegrin) their independence or the enjoyment of security and other rights during their subjection to the sovereign state, namely, Turkey. In 1826 Serbia secured autonomy, while Greece proclaimed her independence and secured it through the war of 1821. Russia played an important part in the liberation of Bulgaria. When, in 1908, Turkey adopted the constitution and a new regime was entered upon, Bulgaria proclaimed her complete independence of the Sultan and formally annexed Eastern Roumelia to the national kingdom. In these various events Europe had often participated effectively. A fleet composed of English, French, and Russian ships, by defeating a Turkish fleet off Navarino, helped Greece to secure her independence. In the Congress of Berlin the treaty of San Stephano, concluded after the defeat of Turkey by Russia, was mutilated and radical agreements were adopted with the end of bringing Turkey to reason. Nevertheless, the work of the Congress was ineffective because it went only halfway through its provisions; Greece was deprived of Epirus and Bulgaria was granted autonomy but not independence. Moreover, the Congress demanded that reform be instituted in the administration of Macedonia; the Sultan promised to obey, but, as the Congress did not back its demands by force, he did nothing actually. The Balkan nations thereupon took the matter into their own hands, and organized societies whose purpose it was to equip and send insurgent bands into Macedonia to help the people maintain their national rights and resist the Turkish yoke. This was one of the causes of

the Greco-Turkish war in 1897, another cause being the revolution in Crete, the inhabitants of which desired to unite with the independent kingdom of Greece. In this war the Greeks were easily defeated by the Turks and forced to pay an indemnity. Another war that took place was that between Turkey and Italy in 1911, the cause being Italy's determined policy to take possession of Tripoli, in North Africa. This war was continued up to the outbreak of the first Balkan war and after, and was concluded by the treaty of Lausanne, in which Turkey complied virtually with all of Italy's demands.

We will now consider the Balkan Wars in some detail, in their origins and results. The chief cause of the first Balkan War was the ill-treatment which the Christians suffered in European Turkey at the hands of the governing officials. Macedonia, as we have hinted, was terribly mismanaged, but the Sultan ward off interference by the European Powers by piling promises upon promises for reform. In 1908 the Turkish revolution promised to solve the difficulties, but after a short interval the Young Turks showed themselves to be even more chauvinistic than the Turks of the old regime. They adopted the policy of the extinction of the national sentiment in the consciousness of the subject races and the merging of the latter into one homogeneous Turkish state. And to enforce this policy the Young Turks began to employ the most violent measures. They oppressed the peoples and caused their leaders to be assassinated; the massacres at Kotchana and Berane served as the climax, and the first Balkan War broke out. The Carnegie Commission thus summarizes the causes of the first Balkan War: "First, the weakness and want of foresight of Turkey, on the verge of dissolution; second, the powerlessness of Europe to impose on a constitutional Turkey the reforms which she had suc-



KING CONSTANTINE XII
OF GREECE

ceeded in introducing into an absolute Turkey, and third, the consciousness of increased strength which alliance gave to the Balkan states, each with a national mission before it, namely, the protection of the men of its race and religion dwelling in Turkey against the Ottomanization policy which threatened national existence."

In March, 1912, Serbia and Bulgaria concluded an offensive alliance against Turkey, and in May, Greece became a party to the same agreement. King Nicholas of Montenegro supplied the spark by proclaiming war against Turkey on October 9; on October 13 the allies demanded large concessions and Turkey replied by declaring war on the 17th. The events of this war, in which Turkey suffered a crushing defeat, may be summarized as follows: The Greek army entered Macedonia by the Meluna pass, caused the Turks to retreat at Pente-Pighadia and met the Turkish army in a pitched battle at Sarantaporon, and defeated it. The Crown Prince (now King Constantine XII of Hellenes) entered Veria on October 30th, and from there the army took the road to Salonika. At Yenije the Turkish army made a determined stand, but was again defeated, and the way to Salonika became now practically open. The city itself surrendered to the Greek Crown Prince Constantine on November 8th. In the meantime the Greeks embarked upon a siege of the strong fortress of Yanina in Epirus. Here the Turks were well fortified and offered stiff resistance under Essad Pasha. But after a protracted siege, owing to a clever ruse of the Crown Prince and the gallantry of the Greek soldiers, Yanina fell on the 5th of March, 1913. Through her navy, Greece effected a blockade of Turkish ports, prevented the sending of reinforcements from Syria to Thrace by the Turkish staff, paralyzed Turkish trade and commerce and

occupied all the Aegean Islands except the "Dodekanese," which had been previously seized by Italy.

Bulgaria began the war under brilliant auspices. The Bulgarian army at once occupied Mustapha-Pasha near the frontier, and on the 24th of October captured Kirk-Kilisse after inflicting a severe defeat upon the Turkish forces. From there the main Bulgarian army moved on to Lules-Burgas, where it encountered a Turkish army numbering about 150,000. The battle began on the 29th, and by the evening of the 31st the Turks were in disorderly retreat toward Tschorlu. At Bunat Hissar they suffered a fresh defeat, and withdrew as fast as they could to the intrenched lines of Tchatalja, where they withstood successfully the onset of the Bulgarian troops. The siege of Adrianople which intervened furnished a very dramatic episode in the war. The Bulgarians began the bombardment of the city the 28th of October, but they soon recognized that it would be too risky and rather unwise to attempt to capture the city at once by storm, so they established a close blockade of the city, but without abating the intensity of the fighting. An armistice was declared in the meantime, but with no results, and fighting was resumed. Adrianople fell into the hands of Gen. Ivanoff the 26th of March. 1913.

The Serbian army entered Macedonia through old Serbia, and defeated the Turkish forces decisively at Kumanovo. Thereupon it proceeded southward and defeated again the enemy before Monastir and captured the city. Both Serbians and Montenegrins invaded Albania of which the former captured Durazzo, and the latter, after a very protracted and difficult siege, Scutari. But here they were confronted by the interests of the Austro-Italian agreement and were compelled by the European concert to evacuate both of these cities. Let us add that in the meantime they had made good

their hold at Novi Bazar, a sanjak which Austria had left to Turkey when she annexed the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Balkan allies met Turkish plenipotentiaries at London and signed a treaty of peace, but in the meantime differences began to crop up among the allies themselves over the division of the spoils. By a previous treaty between Serbia and Bulgaria Serbia had agreed not to get any Turkish territory beyond the Ochrida-Solema-Vreh line in Macedonia; nevertheless, by advancing to Prilip and Monastir she actually did cross this line. When Bulgaria demanded observance of the conditions of the treaty Serbia demurred, stating that external circumstances had changed. For one thing, Austria and Italy had obstructed Serbia's path toward the sea in the Adriatic; Serbia therefore was deprived of her legitimate spoils and claimed the right to seek compensation elsewhere. Secondly, the Bulgarians had not given to the Serbians the military aid which the treaty stipulated; on the contrary, it was the Serbians who had helped the Bulgarians. Serbia thereupon demanded revision of the treaty; Bulgaria refused, and then procrastinated over proposals to arbitrate the question; but the military party hurried matters and on June 28th General Savof, of Bulgaria, ordered an attack against the Serbians. At the same time Bulgaria was extremely dissatisfied with the occupation of Salonika by the Greeks, and the Bulgarian general treacherously ordered an attack against the Greek army as well, hoping by the suddenness of the attack to succeed in separating the Greeks from the Serbians on the field. The latter at once ordered a counter-attack in defense, and the second Balkan war began, in which war Bulgaria was punished for her aggressiveness and suffered complete defeat. On July 9th the Serbians took Radovitch; on the 14th, Kriva Palanka, and on the 21st they

were besieging Vidine. The Greeks, on the other hand, at once disarmed and made captive the Bulgarian regiment at Salonika, and on June 29th routed, after a three days' battle, the Bulgarians at Kukush. They also defeated the enemy at Lahana, and secured a junction with the Serbian army; on the 9th of July the Greeks occupied Strummitza, captured in the meantime the important cities of Kavala, Seres and Drama, and by forced marches reached the Bulgarian frontier at Djouma-ya (25-30). Turkey, too, seized the opportunity and advanced into Thrace, reconquered the lost territory, and recaptured Adrianople. On July 11th the Roumanian army crossed the Bulgarian frontier and began to advance against Sophia. On July 11th Bulgaria appealed to Europe for help; on the 21st accepted the demands of Roumania, and on the 31st negotiations were opened at Bucharest. A treaty was signed on August 10, by which Bulgaria had to yield practically all the fruits of her victory in the first war; to Turkey she ceded not only Adrianople, but Kirk-Kilisse as well, and to Roumania, who claimed compensation for her neutrality during the first war, the north-eastern corner of the country itself, embracing a population of about 300,000.

So much about the two Balkan wars. How were they connected, may we ask, with the origin of the present war? For one thing, through the intrigues of Austria, Serbia was again shut off from the Adriatic littoral and from the sea. In this way the hostility of Serbia was provoked, and agitations began for a Pan-Slav movement which naturally was directed toward the Slavs in Austria as well as in Serbia. The creation of Albania as an independent state supplied another fruitful cause of discord. Artificial boundaries were erected between Albania and Greece on the one hand, and Albania and Serbia on the other. Albania could not keep the peace



KING FERDINAND
OF ROUMANIA

within her own borders, and so an international commission was appointed, when Scutari fell, to control the affairs. Later a German prince was sent as a ruler, but in a short time he had to confess his failure by leaving his kingdom. Another abnormal element in the situation was the reoccupation of Thrace by Turkey, and her consequent re-entrance into Europe. Turkey had again taken what she could not permanently keep, and she began, as before, to oppress the native population. And finally, the dissolution of the Balkan League was in a sense a blow to Russian diplomacy and a success for Austrian diplomacy. The Czar's appeals to both Bulgaria and Serbia that they arbitrate their differences had failed of its object, and Austrian counsel had prevailed. Again, intrigues on the Balkan soil, carried on by diplomats of the neighboring states, were rife.

Before we proceed to recount the immediate events which preceded the outbreak of the Great War, we will make use of a few lines to mention the distribution of alliances in Europe. The two great factors were the Triple Alliance on the one hand, comprising Germany, Austro-Hungary and Italy, and the Triple Entente on the other, comprising Great Britain, France and Russia. How did these alignments come about? The Austro-German alliance was formed in 1879 and Italy entered later (1882). At first Russia was friendly with Germany and, as we have seen, was a member of the Three Emperors' League of which Germany and Austria were the other members. But when in 1875 the Czar sided with France in order to shield her from the hostile intentions of Germany, and when later, in 1878, in the Congress of Berlin, Bismarck was an arbiter rather than a champion of Russia's claims, the feeling between Russia and Germany quickly cooled. A rivalry grew up between Russia and Austria with respect to the eastern question, and more particularly with


respect to gaining influence and control over the Balkans. So Germany and Austria allied themselves in 1879, pledging to defend themselves against Russia. The union of Italy with the Dual Alliance in 1882 seemed rather unnatural. But Italy had quarrels with France as to the distribution of the territory in Northern Africa; she felt her interests to be threatened, and, conscious of her weakness, sought the help of stronger friends. But in allying herself with Austria she was forced to crush down all longings for the liberation of Italians under the rule of the latter; nevertheless, these longings have reasserted themselves of late, and Italy has regained her freedom of action by denouncing the said treaty of alliance.

On the other hand, France felt continually the menace of the German invasion, and, looking for aid in self-defense, initiated a friendly understanding with Russia, which gradually developed into a formal alliance. England in the meantime kept aloof in lonely isolation. She had various differences with France which kept the feeling between them cool; France looked askance at the occupation of Egypt by England and indeed expected the latter to vacate Egypt ultimately, but this England had no intention to do, and in the Fashoda incident war was averted only by the yielding of France. France and England fortunately found a way out of their difficulty about Egypt in 1904. England promised not to obstruct French extension in Morocco, and France, on her side, recognized the British occupation of Egypt. They also settled their old disputes about fishing in Newfoundland, also about Siam, the Niger, Madagascar and, in general, about their possessions in West Africa. A little later, England found herself approaching closer to Russia, of which she had been heretofore suspicious with respect to her possession of India. In 1907, England and Russia reached an

agreement as to their interests in Afghanistan, Persia and Tibet. The agreements of England with France and with Russia, respectively, were quite independent processes, and it is wrong to construe these agreements as alliances for common action against continental foes. There were, indeed, understandings between the military staffs of the three states respectively, but these were in no way binding upon the governments of the states, and had no influence upon their general policies. But naturally, when trouble broke out in Europe, and Germany with Austria took one side, the Entente became converted into an Alliance, though it is again true to say, that England felt free to keep out of the war unless her interests became imperiled. Nevertheless, a crushing defeat of France would have meant unquestionably the aiming of a hard blow at England, and the latter could not help coming to the aid of France in her opposition to the Teuton Alliance.

We have so far considered the general and ultimate causes of the present war, namely, Anglo-German rivalry, Franco-German opposition, Slav-Teuton rivalry, German world-policy, and the Eastern question. We will now examine the *immediate causes* of the war, consisting, as they do, in the events which immediately preceded its outbreak. Undoubtedly, the assassination of the Austrian heir to the throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, at Serajevo, by a Serbian patriot, was the spark which set Europe ablaze. The above event took place on the 28th of June. July 23 Austria addressed an ultimatum to Serbia demanding a reply within twenty-four hours. In the ultimatum Austria claimed that Serbia had pursued consistently a policy tending to disintegrate the empire by her attitude of protest against the annexation of Bosnia and her encouragement of a movement to alienate the Slavs in the monarchy from their government. Austria demanded that Serbia stop and disavow all propa-

ganda tending to the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and adopt severe and strict judicial proceedings in order to punish the persons who were guilty of the assassination of the Archduke, accepting the collaboration of representatives of the Austro-Hungarian government in the investigation relative thereto. Serbia at once communicated with Russia, and the latter replied that she could not be disinterested in the matter. Thus, at once the matter lost its local character and assumed import for all the powers. Thereupon, Sir Edward Grey communicated with his various ambassadors in the court of the European powers and proposed that the four other powers, not interested directly in the discussion, namely, Germany, France, Italy and Great Britain, mediate in favor of moderation in Vienna and at St. Petersburg. In the meantime, the Serbian government handed a reply to the Dual monarchy practically yielding in all points not derogatory to its dignity; nevertheless, the reply was pronounced unsatisfactory by the monarchy. Upon this Sir Edward Grey proposed that the German, French and Italian ambassadors should meet him in conference immediately, in order to discover some way out of the complication. But Germany did not accept the proposal, stating that it could not be consonant to the dignity of a great power to refer to arbitration a difference which it had with a smaller state. Sir Edward Grey replied that if it was a question of the "form of the proposal," he would be ready to accept any suggestion from the German government. The latter did not reply immediately, and in the meantime Austria declared war upon Serbia (July 28). It was then proposed that direct conversations be opened between Vienna and St. Petersburg; also, Russia, upon learning of the mobilization in Austria, ordered mobilization in four of her southern districts. This movement was not directed against Germany, but was meant only



KING ALBERT
OF BELGIUM

as a reply to the Austrian mobilization. On July 31 Austria expressed readiness to resume conversations with Russia, but Germany intervened and hurried matters. Germany threatened to mobilize unless Russia ceased military preparations. But Austria began to mass troops near her Russian frontier, and Russia, confronted with the contingency of a war against a great power, ordered a general mobilization. In the meantime, telegraphic communications passed between the Kaiser and the Czar, but to no avail, and on July 31 Germany presented an ultimatum to Russia demanding that her mobilization should cease within twenty-four hours, and also presented another ultimatum to France asking her to define her attitude in the eventuality of war. The French government replied on the 1st of August that it would consult its own interests and on the same day ordered general mobilization. Germany, declaring the attitude of Russia unsatisfactory, as well as that of France, ordered general mobilization on August 1; on August 2 invaded Luxembourg, and on August 4 entered Belgian territory. Previously (July 31) Sir Edward Grey had asked France and Germany whether they would respect Belgian neutrality in case of mutual war; the former had replied she would, but Germany was non-committal. On August 3 the latter sent an ultimatum to Belgium demanding that it grant passage to the German troops through its territory. The Belgian King then appealed to King George of England, and on the 4th of August England presented an ultimatum to Germany asking for assurances respecting the preservation of Belgian neutrality and demanding a reply by 12 o'clock midnight. Germany made no reply, and Great Britain declared war on Germany on the same date. As Germany had already declared war on Russia on the 1st and on France on the 4th, the conflict thus became general.

CHAPTER IX.

PEACE WITH JUSTICE.

We have now ended our survey of the history of the wars throughout Europe. We are aware of the fact that not all military campaigns have been included in our survey, but we can claim that the large majority of them have received attention, and indeed a sufficient amount and proportion on the one hand to furnish an idea of the role which war has played on the stage of human life in Europe and, on the other, to constitute a relatively clear background for an investigation into war itself, its nature and effects. Upon this last topic we will now enter.

Just now everyone seems to have made up his mind that war is bound to go. It appears to be generally taken as granted that war has played its last card and that it has lost. Mars, the god of warfare, makes his appearance in such appalling horror, drenched with so much blood, that every would-be worshiper is instantly repelled. Humanity is forced to drink now its fill of misery from the goblet of war, but, once through, is determined to throw away the goblet and dash it into pieces.

But perhaps the feeling is not absolutely universal. War has its advocates on principle, though their voices may not

be so loud at the present moment. The masses in Germany may be against war, but most of the leaders there are undoubtedly war's pronounced champions. They, along with their docile disciples, see glory in war where others discover misery; they see justice in war's awards in spite of war's apparent brutality; and morally ennobling influence and tendency to render the character of the people hardy and virile—at least so they claim to see. Where others discover absolute waste in warfare, they see a process of dispensing with the accumulated rubbish of civilization; where others see ruthless destruction, they discover a force working for the survival of the fittest and best. We need not linger on the arguments of this party; Ruskin has voiced the same sentiment in eloquent language and German philosophy has supplied the theoretical justification of the ideal of militarism. It is not our purpose to combat this position immediately; we may merely remind ourselves that there is always something to be said for even the most harmful and wicked of human agencies, and wrangles and personal encounters in the street between two individuals may claim approval upon the same grounds which the militarists adduce in favor of war. The said fight calls forth all the men's latent physical strength, exercises their muscles, is provoked by each one's (true or mistaken) sense of injured dignity, and it gives the victory to the strongest—which in Nature's language may mean the fittest.

But, besides the above, there is another group of thinkers who, as against the former, may sincerely deplore war and its inevitable effects, yet are thoroughly convinced that humanity can simply not do without war, not because of lack of desire to dispense with war, but because war is, so to speak, part and parcel of the general course of things, and that consequently all efforts aiming to prevent the occur-

rence of war are necessarily bound to be futile. The views of the said party merit serious and considerable attention, because they are important, derived from an objective consideration of facts, and are absolutely unbiased and uninfluenced by motives of passion and interest.

To take the matter up—our eyes are directed by this party to the spectacle disclosed to us by the investigations of Malthus and Darwin; before us is unfolded the view of Nature in evolution, whose supreme law is the struggle for existence. To live implies to struggle, and to survive means to conquer. Development appears to be the result of a painful, incessant, and uncompromising combat among individuals. Each organic unit is the potential and legitimate prey of its fellows, and indeed of any other unit. Moreover, the fight seems exclusively brutal; physical force is the test of ability to survive, and to be fit, as we have already suggested, is to be strong. And the law of the jungle is the law of the mountain and valley and open field, of the hamlet and of the metropolitan city. In other words, struggle, brutal, bloody, desperate struggle, is presented as the ultimate and inmost law of living things, if not of inanimate things as well. On the level of matters human, within the sphere of business, it appears as the law of out-and-out competition, and in the sphere of the relations of nations it appears in the shape of continual, deadly warfare. Thus, war is seen to be inseparable from life, and the God of War to be at once the God of All.

In view, then, of this general outlook, serious-minded people are led to take a fatalistic attitude toward the question of the prevention of war. Whether we like it or not, it is alleged, war must stay always with us. Competition lies at the root of all change and development, and, however brutal, immoral, and depraving be its effects, it is a fact to be

faced and acquiesced in. The ruthless God is there, and He commands and compels worship.

Such a *weltanschauung*, if valid, must surely provide food for anxious thought. But we feel strong misgivings as to its tenability. Is the situation really as bad and hopeless as portrayed? Is the world inalienably committed to an immoral, inhuman order of Providence? Can it be that Nature is divided against itself, so that while in man (at least) it creates sentiments of altruism, solidarity, and pity, it nevertheless is essentially ruthless, and endures solely through rapacious strife and conquest? As a matter of fact, is competition in the shape of warfare a necessary element in the makeup of organic life?

Now, this is precisely the point of view from which we intend to tackle the question of war. And if after consideration we conclude that there is no fatal necessity compelling the waging of war, we will find ourselves breathing a freer atmosphere, and feel competent to take a more forceful and practical attitude toward the problem of war. We will then ask ourselves what the means are which will ensure its cessation.

But perhaps we can take our position on a still higher point of view. War, whether bad or good, is actually a factor in the life of humanity, and questions about war merge with questions as to the general good of humanity. In other words, looking at things from a more comprehensive standpoint, the problem confronting us concerns not war directly, but the welfare of the nations and states in general, and, incidentally, the place and function of war in this welfare as analyzed and agreed upon. In other words, our first question, thus expanded, takes the following form: What is the most desirable and at the same time most practicable ideal of the organization of nations and states,—and

is war demanded by the exigencies of this ideal? Our second question will be: What is the best means of realizing the ideal as ascertained, and, in case the ideal excludes war, what is then the most practical means of exterminating war? Our first question is obviously of a theoretical and our second question of a practical import. In effect, we put Plato's question to ourselves, and proceed to formulate the structure of the ideal quality, ideal in the sense that it is both eminently desirable and ultimately practicable—with the view of ascertaining at the same time whether within this structure war finds a place, either as contingent or as necessary. And then we will ask ourselves how we can put this ideal to practice, and, in so far as we conclude that the conception of the best constitution for humanity, on the one hand, and the practice of war, on the other, are mutually exclusive, we will consider the means for doing away with war in the most efficient and thorough fashion.

A.

We begin with the first question. Now, the principle must be admitted true that progress is achieved by nature through competition, so that the fittest is awarded the prize, namely, life itself. To be sure, competition plays a very prominent role in the lives of civilized, as well as uncivilized, peoples at the present day, constituting the regulating factor in business and culture. It would be foolish to decry competition and to set up an ideal which eliminates competition; we know from experience that competition is needed to furnish the steam to keep things going; that competition, only, prevents individuals and organizations from slackening in pace; that by competition the muscles of the body and of the soul are hardened and trained. But grant-

ing the supremacy of competition, does it follow, as militarist philosophy claims it does, that strife is the universal law, that the normal state of feeling between the individual organisms is hatred as well as mere indifference, and the normal attitude of behavior mutual opposition, owing to the fact that the good of the one may be secured only at the expense of that of the rest? Does granting that competition is the unchangeable law of Nature involve the admission of the contention that war is necessary—in short, does competition imply warfare? Co-operation appears to be the rule of Nature, as well, for our civilized life makes use of the forces of both competition and co-operation, and even among individuals, the grouping of organisms for mutual help is practiced and encouraged. Possibly Nature contradicts itself; but before accepting this unwelcome conclusion, let us carefully examine the nature of competition with the end of seeing if it really necessitates the state of warfare among individuals and the groups of individuals, and whether it thus excludes co-operation.

I. Now, from the very first we must insist that the field of competition is Nature, and the ultimate struggle is waged by man against Nature in order that he might secure control over her. Not man against man, but man against Nature. After all, in the last analysis, man exerts himself, toils and struggles in order to realize in fact his right to exist, and the goal of his efforts is the assurance of a comfortable living. Now, since Nature is the ultimate environment of life, the background of all human activity, the sole storehouse of energy and nourishment, it is from Nature that man will wrest his living; if man must toil, he toils with Nature,—if he must struggle it is against Nature whenever she is stingy and unyielding,—if he needs to conquer, it must be Nature, whenever she raises her forces of wind and storm and quakes

to resist the onset of the army of humanity. The legitimate prey of man, if such there be at all, cannot be his fellow, for why indeed should man turn his greedy eyes in the direction of the other fellow, who is born obviously naked and bare of fortune, instead of turning in the direction of the common source of both, to the power of bringing them about and providing the food with which their souls and bodies are to be nourished—in short, Nature?

Now, in this struggle, competition does indeed enter as between men, but in indirect fashion. Thus, individuals compete with each other in their efforts to exploit Nature, and the victor is the one who succeeds in making the most of her resources. If such be the case, competition does not mean, necessarily, a mutual fight between the human groups, but is a contest where primarily the adequate provision of material for the satisfaction of the vital needs of each constitutes the test of worth and the prize of achievement. Such competition is indirect so far as the individuals are concerned, because the competition holds directly not of the individuals, but of the relation of each individual to a third objective, namely, Nature.

Competition is obviously a process whereby the relative worth of two or more individuals is made evident. The final point of view is that of the relation of the organism to Nature in general, and not of the organism to another organism. Hence, Nature recognizes in fact the worth of the peoples in so far as they make the most of her and not in so far as they make the most of each other. Thus, mutual struggle is not strictly relevant to competition as Nature calls for it. An individual or community which succeeds in suckling enough out of the bosom of Mother Earth, and in completely adapting itself to the great environment—such an organism proves itself worthy in the eyes of Nature, and as

such is adjudged a winner in the universal competition,—and another organism which shows signs of weakness in responding to the natural stimuli, which squanders instead of using, which idles while the others are gathering the harvest,—such an organism is declared wanting and adjudged a loser.

The measure of worth in this competitive struggle is determined by the fact that an organism, in responding to the environment, is simply working to satisfy its vital needs and attain the fullest life it can, and the individual who succeeds in adjusting himself to the environment will be the one to enjoy the fullest life and thus to prove himself the fittest to survive. Moreover, the competition is selective, in that the nourishment which the individual may wrest from the hands of Nature being of a limited amount, given two individuals, the fitter among them will run away with all he can of the stock and consequently the weaker will not be left with nourishment sufficient for his needs, and will hence succumb. Also, since the material is not furnished by Nature spontaneously, and since when extracted from her it is in raw shape, the individual must be active and diligent, both in securing the material and in converting it into the form suitable to make it nourishing. Consequently, the inert and indolent fellow will be anticipated and surpassed by the diligent fellow in the contest to obtain the food.

In short, the competition for life is like a running race where two individuals compete to attain a distant goal; now, the conflict between the two operates in terms of their relation to a common object, and is hence indirect, and the prize is awarded to the one who proves abler by running the faster. If we now grant that the goal and prize of the competition is Life, we get the natural competition for survival. From this point of view, warfare would mean direct strife between

the competitors, and as such is not called for, since in the competition which Nature carries out the competitors do not fight each other respectively, but both strive with all their strength to attain a specific goal. Let us illustrate:

A and B are two individuals engaged in mutual competition; to decide the contest through mutual warfare would by analogy imply that A tries to get ahead of B by forcibly taking hold of B and keeping him back, or, say, causing B to trip and fall and thus to lag behind.

But this would surely be a wrong way of waging the competition. The fitness of the competitor in the struggle for life is measured not by his capacity to ruin his rival, but by his superior attainments in the race to exploit the resources of Nature, and the competition is settled not by a direct fight between the parties concerned, but in terms of the difference of the relation on the part of each to the environment. And the same applies to collections of individuals. There is no call by the law of evolution for direct conflict among the peoples. The competition may and should operate indirectly and the award be made automatically. Here we have Germany and England, two rival states. Let Germany strain her energies and extend her commerce, increase her agricultural output and multiply her industrial produce, and let England lag behind, and the latter will speedily succumb.

In general, then, a nation may completely surpass another in the race for the common goal of adjustment to the environment and control of natural forces, and may secure the right to live, by actually putting up a speedier pace than its rival and in thus outstripping the latter. The alternative presented by war is for a nation to attempt to win the race by causing injury upon its rival nation, and thus incapacitating it as a competitor; such an alternative, if our observa-

tions on the nature of competition are correct, is neither necessary nor proper, but is rather abnormal.

To sum up, we have distinguished between a competitive struggle, on the one hand, which possesses the character of a race, whose prize is life, and which is decided by the fact that this or that competitor attains the goal first and thus deprives his rival of the prize sought for—and another form of competitive struggle on the other hand which consists in a direct combat between the parties themselves, each attempting to injure and ruin his rival and thus remain the sole survivor in the race. The first is the natural form of competition, and the second, constituting warfare, is uncalled for.

II. So far, we have tried to prove—we hope with success—that competition does not imply warfare and that, to say the least, war and mutual conflict of any form between individuals and nations are not necessary elements in the carrying out of the laws of Nature relative to the struggle of life and the elimination of the unfit. Still, it might be insisted that though war may not be necessary, it is possibly desirable and hence is employed by Nature. To this proposition we return a decided negative. War is not desirable in the scheme of natural selection as reflected in the law of competition, and for the following reasons:

(a) Warfare works against co-operation, and, as we shall have reason to see, co-operation is necessary to the carrying out of the unconscious ends of Nature. Warfare implies the rupture of relations among the competitors, and destructive struggle waged by each against all; now, given that co-operation is useful, that form of competition which entails warfare must necessarily be undesirable and be superseded by another form which does not exclude competition, namely, the one we have been advancing.

(b) Warfare promotes waste and destruction. The competitors fight among themselves and the winner is the sole survivor as well. Now, however prodigal Nature may be, she never courts waste for its own sake. The propagation of life is the end to which she automatically tends, and abundance of life is therefore desirable. Consequently, if there is a way to carry on competition without mutual strife among the competitors and without consequent destruction of life, but indirectly, that way is to be preferred to the method which entails destruction and waste. The latter must be discarded, and the former—which, as we have urged, exists—must be employed instead.

(c) Thirdly, and the most important, war does not really constitute a fair test of worth and therefore does not minister in any way to the ends of competition. In other words, war not only possesses disadvantages in carrying out the ends of competition, but it really does not carry them out at all. The reason is, that war is not a reliable and fit test for the selection of the fittest, owing to the following causes:

1. When A and B are running in the race, if A hits B or causes B to fall down, then if A forges ahead and arrives first at the finish, it will certainly not mean that A was actually the better of the two as a runner. Warfare decides the issue by eliminating all the competitors except one, and thus results in the elimination of the contest itself.

2. Again, an organism which is highly developed, but small in size, may go down under the heavy foot of the bigger organism—a small but civilized and developed nation may thus be trampled under foot (as has happened in history during the incursions of primitive Asiatics in Europe) by hords of brutal savages. Thus, the accidental bringing together of large numbers may prove the determining factor in the fight, whereas, really such a verdict, as determined by

mere numbers, is invalid in the court of appeals of evolving Nature. Not only size in numbers, but relative advantage in point of brute force as well, may, in direct warfare, determine the victory in case one of the combatants is equipped with spiritual rather than brutal forces; a burly, brawny giant will fight and easily put down or kill a tenderly-built woman; nevertheless, a woman may, and does in this instance, represent a highly evolved organic product. Thus, war reverses the verdict of Nature by introducing factors such as superiority in numbers and in brute force, which are of no overwhelming consequence in the normal working out of competition. By the test of Nature, the woman may be very fit, in that she is fulfilling her end by propagating life and bringing it up properly and may thus be adapting herself to the circumstances more intelligently than the muscular male.

3. Or one of the parties may take unfair advantage of its rivals, and pounce upon them unawares—e. g., it is claimed by the allies, Germany has done as against the members of the Entente, by preparing secretly for years manufacturing arms and equipping herself in all ways, and then attacking them at the moment which suited her best. After all, the fitness of an individual or a nation is determined in relation to its adjustment to Nature, whose product it is and by whom it is supported in life, and not by its capacity to put down a fellow individual or sister nation through use of illegitimate means in a struggle whose outcome depends on so many strange and accidental factors.

Thus, we conclude that war is not only unnecessary, but undesirable as well, as a form of competition; if it exists, therefore, it is rather as an abnormality, similar to many other evidences of atavism which one discovers abundantly in Nature, than as a process tested and approved of and in-

corporated into the general scheme. We will try to show in the next paragraph that brutal warfare does not take place in nature, after all, on so large a scale as many seem to think.

III. For one thing, the condition of family life prevalent among many species of animals is a standing contradiction of the view that warfare is all dominant. Especially among the vertebrates and particularly among birds, we discover touching instances of parental devotion and sacrifice. In such cases, the individual exists neither as self-assertive nor as exclusive of the others, but as congenial, concerned with the welfare of the others, altruistic. Indeed, why fail to mention man and his condition of life, for is not man the child of Nature pre-eminently, the animal par excellence? Well, the family life among the members of the human species seems to be by far the most generally pervasive of forms of grouping. Instances where this relationship is absent exist, but they exist as exceptions rather than as in conformity to natural usage. The sentiments of pity, self-forgetfulness in the remembrance of the other, love, and self-sacrifice are the natural prerequisites and outgrowths of the family life. And surely it is too much of an insult against our intelligence to be told by Nietzsche and his followers that hatred and conquest, treading down the weak and improving oneself by making stepping stones of the other fellow's corpse, is the only or the true order in Nature. By what right may a person select one out of the two as essential or proper and neglect the other or brand it as unnatural?

Coming to the assertion of Neo-Darwinians that mutual struggle and bestial warfare are the governing powers, we find in Nature abundant facts illustrating the law of an opposite character, namely, co-operation. Animals go by herds, they protect themselves in common, secure their food in common, even fight in common; of men, savages, supposedly

closest to Nature, live a social life; they go by tribes and races; when they hunt they make groups and go off together. Thus, both animals and uncivilized men move on a level where not only the individual, but society as well, is a unit; they recognize their good as bound up with that of the rest; they act with the others rather than, or as well as, against them. It is not our intention in the least to deny the facts of struggle and conflict, but evidently social and co-operative life is a fact equally significant. Throughout the course of development we find that both these processes prevail—co-operation as well as conflict—and it is becoming increasingly clear that co-operation is gaining slowly but surely the upper hand. Co-operation starts among animals, along with warfare; sometimes it is overshadowed by direct competition, sometimes it overshadows it; it survives on the human level and there it gains a new momentum. On the plane of human development community-life and community-activity appear gradually to supersede individualism and disruption. In the sphere of business is this fact, perhaps, most strikingly manifest, where out of unbridled laissez-faire procedure and uncompromising competition of each producer against the rest, we have seen and see still evolving a state of affairs in which combination dominates the scene, where organization conquers disorganization, and where any one who obstinately refuses to keep up with the movement inevitably goes to the wall. Community institutions replace mere individual outbursts, and concentration in productive action is proved to be superior to unorganized output of energy. The days of direct competition among the parties concerned seem to be numbered, and co-operation is coming to its own. Why not say, then, that war as well represents a phase of the same order of things, an initial experiment of Nature which is now being discarded for something better, so that if war sud-

denly reappears here and there it is the expression of an atavistic reversion to a state outgrown and superseded? That spirit of co-operation which is coming to infuse all organic and human activity, is it not bound to penetrate into the domain of the relations of states and do away with the forces of disruption? If indeed we have read the signs of the times aright, the God of militancy is after all made of mortal flesh, and modern deities and creative agencies are fast driving him out of the Olympian heights of supremacy and dominion.

To conclude this section, we have argued that from the point of view of competition, warfare is neither a necessary nor a desirable factor, nor indeed a prevailing process in Nature. Thus, our ideal, negatively considered, excludes war. Positively, we have seen so far that Nature tends to enhance the movement toward co-operation among organisms, and that particularly among human individuals this movement has received a very strong impetus. The view is at once suggested that co-operation is the most desirable, indeed the necessary, form of relationship among individuals. But proof must be given of this contention before it is accepted as a matter of fact. Our discussion of the processes of Nature has disclosed that competition, as distinguished from violent belligerency, does not exclude co-operation and therefore allows it; we will now take a step further and proceed to make clear why co-operation is positively desirable and necessary in the life of individuals and groups of individuals, races and nations.

IV. We may imagine an instance of primitive man who is using his wits and laboring in order to secure the means to satisfy his natural needs. He is instinctively impelled to self-protection and to self-preservation in life. Thus occupied, he may at first, upon seeing another man, try to kill the latter

in order to seize the stores of food he may possess, but in process of time the former learns that a much better way is to USE the other fellow instead of eliminating him. Man discovers this at the moment in which his eyes are opened to the fact that the other fellow is a productive agent as well as a consumer, when he realizes that the ends of both are common, that both want food and that they can obtain an ampler quantity, a superior quality, if they go after it together, than if each by himself. Thus the savage finds that the wild beast, though more than a match for him when alone, becomes an easy prey when with his own prowess he combines the prowess of his fellows. Throughout human development we find this to be the prime lesson learned by man in the course of his evolution. To till the soil is a form of exertion and struggle against Nature, with the end of getting something out of her; now, since all kinds of plant life do not grow on the same soil, and since one and the same individual cannot labor except on a very limited area, if the other soil producing the other plant necessary to the one man is to be cultivated, appeal must be made to the other man. Thus has the principle of the division of labor been fundamentally evolved. The development of agriculture is the simplest and earliest manifestation of co-operation in a common task of forcible acquisition from the same vast storehouse. Industry presents the same phenomenon of using the other fellow to produce what YOU need, and of his using you, to produce what HE needs, both working to subdue the same total group of forces, ultimately, both striving to conquer the same enemy—the elements of Nature which from the human viewpoint are unorganized and aimless. In other words, given two individuals, A and B, having, as they do, the same ultimate aim of discovering and producing material with which to satisfy their normal needs, it would be folly for A to fight and kill

B, in that B in his turn stands for a creative and constructive agency bringing to existence material of which A is in need and may use with profit.

Thus, direct warfare between individuals is not only abhorrent to the moral sensibilities, but unwise and imprudent as well, for the reason that in the long run it reacts injuriously upon both parties concerned, whereas co-operation, on the other hand, is useful and necessary in that the needs and ends of individuals are similar and may be secured in common to the advantage of all, respectively. In a word, to a given individual co-operation is beneficial in that the other fellow is a productive agent, and can help the given individual to increase the output of the latter.

To argue further on this point is unnecessary because humanity seems to have learned this lesson sufficiently in the painful school of experience. But unfortunately it is yet far from the point of applying this fund of knowledge to the level of group and national living. Though individuals have agreed to organize to the end of productive activity, *nations* and *states* have not. Each state seems under the impression that all other states are its natural enemies, that their good is exclusive of its own, that the more it causes them harm, permanent or temporary, the less is itself in danger of deteriorating, and the less it helps them to achieve and create, the more it helps itself to secure its own growth. Thus, each country is practically scared when it finds that its neighbor is on the way to improvement. You feel that your country must gain more and more territory at the expense of mine; I rejoice when I see your country defeated and humiliated. That man is considered a good patriot who thinks and reasons in terms of national egotism, whose desires and sentiments have the supremacy of his own country as their exclusive aim, an aim which in its turn is to be realized by the

diminution of the vital energies of the other countries. For a patriot to experience joy at the progress made by this or that other country is, to say the least, a foolish and superfluous, and at most, a criminal, pastime. Wars are waged for purposes of aggrandizement and the whole country exults when it succeeds in seizing some territory or wresting some other advantage from the hands of the defeated state. This perversion has gained ground to such an extent that oftentimes to refer to a certain individual as belonging to a given nationality is to brand him as morally low or unscrupulous, or incompetent, as if, in individual life, to be long-legged or black-haired or dense-whiskered would involve possession of this or that quality or degree of character. Due to the same malicious point of view, a citizen of a certain nationality in many cases considers himself and his fellow-countrymen as normally superior to the rest, in point of morals as well as of intellect, and unconsciously assumes an attitude of condescension and even contempt toward most of the rest.

It may be protested that we exaggerate things, that a patriot hates the enemies of his country, but loves its allies. But what difference does this make? Is not the ally, though ostensibly secured for self-defense, really courted for purposes of aggression against other countries, and is not the allied state, then, but a temporary aid in putting out of the way the enemy of the present, to become in its own turn the next victim when the sinister arm of the alliance has been consummated, a potential enemy in fact? It is admitted generally that alliances among states, as contracted nowadays, are solely of a political nature, founded not on sincerity but on expediency, whose ends are realized in active opposition to the welfare and aggrandizement of the states outside the alliance. And yet if what we have said of co-operation in

relation to the status of individual life is true, is it not a fortiori true of the mutual relations of groups of individuals, of societies, of states? We are convinced that the deplorable situation, as just exhibited, is the result of entirely wrong sentiments and mistaken conceptions. States are meant to co-operate in productive activity, in the same way as individuals, if they are meant to exist and prosper at all. The method of nature in evolution has called from of old for co-operation in production, as well as for competition in attainment. The common needs of life engender a solidarity among all nations, not to be broken even though when opposed in action, and increasingly intensifying its hold all the while. To deny that solidarity is to close our eyes to fact, to actively resist it even when we admit it as a fact, is to work against our own ultimate good. The existing situation is a matter of false philosophy and of prejudice in thought, and a correct philosophy is called for to oust the false. It is the bounden duty of nations as well as of individuals to co-operate, and there is no demand from the powers that be for wars and destructive conflict between people. The law of evolution is fundamental, but, as we have seen, that law does not exclude co-operation; rather, it calls for it. Evolution means change for the better, the fuller, the fitter, and we know that it is by co-operating to make the most of the resources of Nature that the nations can gain in vitality, by co-operating to exploit its mineral and agricultural stores, by putting their minds together in the invention of practical facilities for so doing, by dividing the labor among themselves in accordance with the ability of each nation, by engaging together in the harnessing of the irrational elements outside man and to the yoke of their common interests. The nations are faced indeed with a struggle, one that makes demands upon their latent energies in the utmost degree, but

the enemy to be overcome is certainly not any member of their own species, but the recalcitrant, inanimate forces about them. As for themselves, the nations must combine if they are to achieve victory in the fray.*

Let us reconsider and recapitulate the argument, as thus far pursued. War has received advocacy on the supposition that it constitutes the agency through which the fitness of an individual or community to survive is determined. Thus, war is praised as an eminently worthy and proper occupation. Moreover, evolution is said to be determined by conflict and selection of the fittest, and, since evolution is a fundamental and necessary law, *conflict*, as a means to its realization, is inevitable. Thus war is necessary as well as desirable.

Taking up both of these considerations we denied (I) that conflict is necessary for the carrying out of the purpose of competition and the achievement of evolution, insisting that competition between men is performed indirectly, with relation to Nature, as happens in a running contest, without involving strife directly between the combatants; therefore, we concluded, the passive attitude of acquiescence toward the situation of war is not justified. (II) We denied that warfare is desirable at all for the purposes of competition alleging (a) that war negates the tendency in the direction of co-operation, (b) it entails destruction and waste, and (c) it fails to serve as a real test of worth among the competitors and as a measure of survival value; therefore, the taking of means to resist and get rid of war are justified and called for. (III) Lastly, we denied that mutual strife is as prevalent as it appears, on the level of organic life, and conversely, we insisted that so far as such strife appears, it constitutes an ab-

*For fuller discussion of the same topic see author's "A World-City of Civilization."


normal growth upon the body of Nature, to be fought against and exterminated.

Constructively, we pointed out that co-operative living is not excluded by the legitimate form of competition, and in fact we found co-operation to be increasingly dominant in the various stages of development among organisms. Proceeding, we agreed that co-operation is both desirable and necessary in so far as the "alter" is a productive agent, and his existence and welfare therefore useful to his fellow, whether it be a case of a single individual or of a whole state, and in so far as co-operation is a means toward ensuring and augmenting the productiveness of each and all individuals. Furthermore, the actual prevalence of the co-operative movement proves that the latter is practicable.

B.

With the above considerations in mind, our next step will be to discuss the nature of co-operation in its character of an indispensable element in our ideal of organization among individuals and peoples.

In effect, such co-operation will receive embodiment in terms of a *federation of all the states in the world*. This conception possesses nothing of the original in it; Mr. Carnegie, a number of years ago, proposed in a bold essay, the constitution of a United States of Europe. Of course, he did not mean to shut the other states out, and it is obvious that a federation, to be permanent, solid and beneficial to humanity as a whole, must embrace all of the existing states within its fold. We need not in this chapter enter into all the details of the scheme, but successful instances of the carrying out of a strictly analogous plan may be noted. Switzerland is one and the United States of America is another; so far as



ANDREW CARNEGIE
"THE PEACE MAN"

we know, neither of the two has grounds for regretting the form of the constitution it has adopted.

The basic principles in the federation of states will be (a) the conservation of the freedom of each state in all of its internal affairs, and (b) the assurance of action by each state, *in unison* with all other states, in all matters which affect the interests of all states in general and which derive from the fabric of their natural inter-relationship. In other words, we must be conservative in our procedure to the extent of never letting the individual state to be deprived of its inalienable right to be master in its own house over all that is contained therein, and we must be *positively constructive* to the extent of never letting the organism of humanity degenerate down to the level of a state egotism, aiming at the promotion of a union of all states, through bonds of legal machinery as well as voluntary adjustment, which will constitute an effective agency for the service to and the satisfaction of all interstate ideals and needs.

In a general way, the above furnishes an answer to the first question which we set to ourselves in the beginning, namely, what is the desirable and at once practicable constitution for human society and whether war is a necessary element in the structure of the constitution? We will now consider more specifically the form which the union of the people will assume and endeavor to anticipate and put out of our way certain objections which may conceivably be raised or indeed have been raised against our own exposition of the most desirable constitution for the regulation of the relationships between men.

V. It will be noticed that the federation as proposed is to be a federation of *states* and may itself be rightly called a *universal* state—"A United World."

Now, a very strong and highly influential section of

thought among English-speaking people, whose views have been particularly well expressed by Mr. Lewis Dickenson, raises a violent protest against the very principle of the state itself, and proposes that the organization of peoples into states be eliminated. It says: Look at the German system—how it defies the state at the detriment of the free life of the individual. The good of the state is regarded as the supreme end of man, and to that good is the individual man ruthlessly sacrificed. More specifically, the objection against the principle of the state which we uphold runs as follows:

(a) Within the state system, the *freedom* of the individuals is shackled, and even destroyed. Man lives surrounded by a coil of rigid rules relating to all practices of his life, under a machine whose working he may not comprehend, but whose direction he blindly binds himself to follow. The machine kills the man; in the vast intricacies and complications of the iron organization, no place is left for initiative, no soil for noble uprisal and revolt, no demand for the consciousness of the essentially personal responsibilities. Instead of a society of individuals engaged in voluntary co-operation, we have a mass of puppets led, but not leading, with all the individual variations crushed into a powder of neutral gray. Don't you see (the claim goes on) how true this is of the German people to-day? The state provides not only for the material but for the intellectual nourishment of the people as well; it determines their convictions, it tells them what to believe as to the origin of the war, and the people, obedient to the suggestion, form their views accordingly. The press is a servile instrument in the hands of the government; the press, which, if anything, is the mouth-piece par excellence of the common man, of the diligent, freely-thinking individual; the press, whose mission, if anything, is to criticise social and official thought and practice on

behalf of the individual. In short, the ideal of the state contradicts the ideal of the individual; it operates against his freedom of action, of thought, of sentiment, of point of view. By denying to him the exercise of these, his supreme rights, it works ultimately toward the extinction within him of the very consciousness of these noble rights. Consequently the state subsists and endures as a mechanism which destroys all that is distinctive of individuality.

(b) The second objection to the state as a useful organization for the people is based upon the alleged positive harm which the organization of the state has caused and causes upon humanity *in general*, and upon the oftentimes immoral character of the state activity. The argument runs thus: A state necessarily finds its good in opposition to the good of the other states, its ambitions involve the humiliation of its fellow-states, their weakening or their subjection to itself. The history of the life of the states is the history of the almost incessant wars undertaken for no valid reason, but due to the fatal opposition between state and state. Judging from history, states have served to separate humanity into belligerent groups, to animate feuds between them, to provoke wars among them, and to diminish the vitality of all.

And then, when it comes to the sense of responsibility, states have shown themselves absolutely devoid of a moral consciousness. A solemn promise, say, is given, but solely with the intention of lulling the other party into unconcern, so that the latter may be unprepared when the attack against it is launched.

Diplomacy, (continues our opponent) the mechanism which connects state with state, has been a breeding-place for conspiracies, fraud, unscrupulous dealings, covetous and aggressive scheming; indeed, in the world of diplomacy, insincerity and hypocrisy are the great-

est of virtues. Let us therefore do away with diplomacy; let us do away with the governmental machinery which it represents, and with the fabric of the state in general. *The sphere of economic and industrial life comprehends without exception all the forms of orderly relationship among societies.* Within this sphere, individuals recognize their fellows, not as citizens of this or that state, as either enemies or allies of the fatherland, but simply as producers, as fellow-livers on this earth, all working out their destinies in common. For a German, considered as he is naturally, a laborer making his living, an Englishman is another individual engaged in the same task, with whom he may trade his wares, both making rightful profit of each other. But the vesture of the state distorts the mental vision of the German as well as of the Englishman, and *qua* belonging to this or that state, they see themselves as potential enemies of each other. In other words, organized in terms of the state, the people assume rights which never touch their conscious life as individuals, as workmen with brawn or brain, and which create divisions among them.

To be more specific, the various European states have organized wars against each other, loudly proclaiming that they are going into battle solely for ends of self-defense. Yet one asks: What has the Russian peasant to fear from the Turkish farmer, and was the Austrian citizen plotting against the prosperity of the Hindoo laborer? The individual citizens of each state had no reason to suspect evil of each other, in fact were in most cases not even aware of the very existence of their fellows. Each one worked peacefully in the field, or in the shop, or in the factory, and it was a complete surprise to practically all, to be informed that they must rise up in arms in order to defend the fatherland against the foe.

Or again, a state may often organize aggressive wars to the end of gaining territory and increasing the prosperity of the commonwealth; the state, it is claimed, *must grow*, and yet it is pointed out by others that there is no relation between this state ambition on the one hand, and individual ambition on the other. The individual is in no wise affected if his country is enlarged by the addition of territory; he will still plod in the same field (in case he returns safe from the war); he will still continue in pursuit of the self-same occupation.

Moreover, the organism of the state, by thus conceiving itself independent of the level of the mere individual, renounces the group of moral obligations which hold on the level of the latter, and determine its conduct solely on the score of expediency.

It thus becomes obvious that the state constitutes an extra factor in the life of the individual, which (factor) is a fruitful source of evil and conflict in that it introduces a whole array of new interests and obligations in no wise relating themselves to the individual's own conscious life. For the sake, then, of re-establishing the moral consciousness on a solid pedestal, for the sake of exterminating a fundamental cause of feud and wars, the fabric of the state must be given up.

VI. So much for our opponent. His arguments are important, but, in our opinion, the majority of them are not well-taken, and the conclusions drawn from all are false, respectively. We may reply to the objections as follows: It may have been noticed, perhaps, that we have let the opponent of the state argue from the point (a) of the relation of the state to the individual, (b) of the relation of the state to the other states, urging (a) that the state negates the freedom of the individual, (b) that actually the organization of

the state has resulted, whenever employed, in the division of humanity into warring groups, in the introduction of new alignments among them which tend to provoke armed conflicts between them, in the destruction of their moral fiber, and thus in the undermining of the stock of the vital energies of humanity.

Now, both arguments call attention to empirical consequences of the employment of the organization of the state, but they do not prove that these consequences issue therefrom necessarily. It may be true that throughout the course of history the state has tended to crush the individual, that it has abused its power and attempted to evade moral responsibility, and finally that it has created divisions among the people, but surely it is foolish to infer from the above that the state has forfeited its right to BE at all. Any instrumentality may be put to abuse, but in order that the matter be put to rights, it is necessary that the said instrumentality be not rejected, but put to *right* use. An agency may be declared positively injurious and fit for rejection only when its employment results in loss to humanity, *necessarily*; now, that such is the case, no proof has been furnished with respect to the mechanism of the state. The Scotchman who threw away the oranges because they were eatable neither as boiled nor as fried, nor as baked, was foolish because he did not make the attempt of eating them raw, and are we so very sure that we have done our best and our all with the state?

(a) It is complained that given state-administration the freedom of the individual is endangered, but is it not also true that given absolute freedom a state of anarchy results, which is the negation of freedom itself? And when organization of the community is lacking, do not efficiency and work reduce themselves to a minimum? And yet hu-

manity must work and must achieve, if it is to continue in life. Achievement, in a sense, is at once the end and the condition of life; it not only constitutes attainment of the ideal, but is the prerequisite for that condition which engenders the ideal. For we have seen that in order to provide nourishment for our vital needs we must cope against Nature and make use of her resources. Now, achievement means securing control of Nature so as to render a given group of her forces subservient to some vital need. If, thus, achievement is granted to be a prime end of life, then organization receives complete justification, for organization is the fundamental condition for efficiency in achievement. Indeed, do let us avoid extremes; let us avoid making of organization the only end, and forgetting the value of freedom as a result, but neither should we be hypnotized by the fair goddess of liberty into a state where we are oblivious of the value and imperative necessity of organization as well. Germany may be now, as alleged, defying the state—that is one extreme, and the individual suffers accordingly; the French Revolution elevated the individual on the divine pedestal—which was another extreme, and the situation became so confused that liberty played directly into the hands of tyranny. An extreme is always bad, whichever direction it takes, but, we repeat, no agency should be condemned absolutely because it has been used to excess. Moderation is the cardinal virtue, as Aristotle taught, and moderation is necessary in matching the forces of organization with the forces of freedom. The eminently desirable solution is one which will secure to the individual an amount of freedom compatible with his conveniently uniting with his fellows in the execution of common tasks. To achieve this is very difficult, but not impossible. And though this solution may never

be realized completely, it must ever serve as the goal for all efforts to secure the welfare of humanity.

More positively, let us add that organization properly enforced will provide fields of activity and realization to the individual, surpassing in wealth those which he owns as such, noble ideals coupled with moral force for their attainment. Organization should be the handmaid of freedom by furnishing the mechanism by which the individual may use his freedom to realize his ideals; both organization and freedom are necessary to the highest ends, and, properly balanced, they co-operate. The state is the objective expression of society thus organized, and reflects to itself the uses and prerogatives of organization as mentioned.

(b) Secondly, it has been complained (A) that states have throughout history been causes of dissensions, and quarrels among people who otherwise would have followed their occupations, respectively, in peace. But, however much we may deplore this condition of affairs, we do not see our way to concluding that therefore the organization of the state must be pronounced wanting and be done away with. We repeat: if things are bad, let us make them better—it is only a coward and moral weakling that would shake the dust off his feet from a task because that task is difficult to perform. Evolution is a slow process and the better is always ahead off; states have made a bad beginning, like most things human, but our own discussion of means to insure co-operation among the peoples is intended to remedy this very situation. We have found the consciousness of solidarity superseding the merely self-regarding instincts; we have found that threads of mutual contact, spiritual as well as material, bind all men together, and we need only avail ourselves of these agencies, strengthening them all the while, in order to secure a victory over the group of cen-

trifugal forces. Thus, without committing ourselves to an impossible Utopia, we may envisage the day when, through the aid of the machinery of federation, wars will be the exception rather than the rule, co-operation will be the normal kind of behavior and its violation will be an act eliciting upon itself condemnation and punishment.

To the argument that the state, by trampling upon ethical consideration, has forfeited its right to exist, we reply similarly. International morals are admittedly on a lower plane than inter-individual morals. It behooves, therefore, all individuals to concentrate their energies upon the task of infusing a new and vigorous sense of responsibility into the stratum of their group-life, and create new ethical ideals for their collective action. Surely there is nothing to warrant the extremely pessimistic view which judges the state as essentially immoral.

But, it is rejoined, the nation, in becoming a state, invests itself with a personality which sets it off from other nations similarly vested—with a self, pretending to rights and claims opposed to like pretences of the selves of other peoples. Thus, *in essence*, the state is a dividing medium, and by claiming transcendence of individual life it aims to emancipate itself from the moral sanctions of the latter.

In reply, we must say that the claims of the state to the possession of a personality of its own are largely and in principle correct. It is wrong to consider the issue from the point of view of the individual merely. A collection of individuals—a group—entails contingencies not met with in the consideration of the units *by themselves* respectively. A society possesses a reality not shared by the individuals singly, and embraces a plane of life introducing new features and new interests. A society is more than its members respectively just as a whole is more than its parts as such. The

principle just enunciated, though apparently illogical, is nevertheless empirically verifiable. The piece of weight which disturbs the equilibrium of the two pans of a balance, consists (say) of a hundred units of weight, but it cannot be said that the disturbance, as an effect, is a resultant of the partial weighing down of each unit as such contemporaneously, for, given only ninety-nine of these units, the scales remain unmoved absolutely. The change of the equilibrium,—as Prof. James once pointed out—is not the sum of the effects of each of the hundred units, but is a single effect caused by the new element introduced by the combination of the hundred together. Again, in the realm of labor, the work performed by many people working together is more in quantity and different in quality from the sum of results achieved by as many people working separately. So, in general, a society constitutes a new plane on which appear new forces and effects. A collection of individuals, in other words, may possess and does possess interests and needs not felt by each individual in the collection, and in this sense, it may be said with truth that the combination of many personalities into a community creates a new personality. We may instance as analogous the fact that an organism is a collection of a multiplicity of small organic units, yet the collective organism lives a *whole* life of its own, with its good and demands as such. Hence we may once for all agree that a community should not be reduced, in discussion, to the status of its members respectively, neither should its ends be calculated and ascertained in terms of those of its members solely.

Now, individuals possess rights bearing upon the region of their mutual relationship, and the state is but the organization of men together in terms of their rights. Hence the state is society in one of its aspects, and whatever has been

said of society in general applies with equal force to society existing as a state. There is nothing artificial or conventional in the organization of individuals into a state. The latter constitutes a stage in the natural evolution of organic life, and consequently it implies a lack of historical perspective to argue as if states were luxuries within the life of society—external guises entailing abnormal and unnatural situations. Of course, man is free to dissolve the state, deny the fact of his social nature, and live in rampant individualism. But he must realize that in so doing he is unmaking an achievement of Nature and retracing the steps of evolution, in order to return to the regime of pre-human or rather pre-civilized life.

Now, one community is offset from another community in so far as each possesses a personality of its own, and so is a state from a state, so that a given state may possess rights of its own in relation to another state, which do not issue from its citizens individually. In such case, the individual must simply unite in spirit with the life of the community as such in order to appreciate the distinctive end for which the fatherland is striving. Nevertheless, (a) nothing justifies the state in acknowledging and pursuing a good permanently opposed to that of its individual citizens. In so far, our opponents are right. It is wrong for the state to sever its life from that of its individual members and work its own salvation independently of theirs. We cannot deny that thus far states have succumbed to the temptation, but we cannot agree that *consequently* the state is necessarily doomed to die. The state is real and it possesses a good of its own, but that good is realized to the fullest extent when founded upon the diligent culture of the good of each individual unit in the group. When once this

truth is recognized, the individuals will subsist no longer as *subjects* but as *citizens* of the state.

The same truth applies with respect to the relation of the state not only to its constituent members but (b) to other states as well. Although people organize themselves into a variety of communities and states, they do not thereby necessarily *divide* themselves from each other by impassable barriers of hatred and discord. We have already argued the matter out, and need not argue again that the states do not necessarily repel each other and that their interests are not irreconcilable, that, on the contrary, a unity, a federation of states, is desirable, and, as in line with the evolving process, is within the sphere of possibility. Humanity constitutes, as it were, a magnetic field where individuals and communities are attracted to each other, and the purpose of the federation, as outlined, is precisely the realization of that set of conditions which are required in the fulfilment of the good of each state.

We have agreed, so far, that the good of the state essentially runs counter neither to the good of the individual members nor to that of the other states. We must (c) also insist that the state should acknowledge moral obligations to the fullest. From the fact that society transcends the plane of individual life, it does not follow by any means that the organism of society is independent of moral considerations. The view that the state stands beyond the moral plane, enunciated by German militarists and their disciples in other countries, is fundamentally false. The view may be traced in the old tradition which conceives government as theoretic and in the maxim that the king is divinely appointed and that consequently he can do no wrong. The king is the concrete representative of the state, and what is true of the former must of course be true of the latter as well.

Now, humanity has always felt the temptation of defying moral authority whenever intoxicated with power. Thus it has defended the dictum that "might makes right." But does not the individual man himself assume the same attitude toward the rest of the animal world, from which he has evolved and than which he has ascended a step higher, in consistently looking at it as a food for his stomach and thus judging of the animals' worth by the measure of their relation to his own wants, and in determining their right to exist by their usefulness to himself, without regard to the vital needs of the animals as such, and of their worth to themselves? This illustration serves merely to show the extent and force of the temptation, but it does not justify in the least the actual conditions with respect to the claims and conduct of the state. In precisely so far as the state is a unit, an organic entity, it sustains relations to its constituent members and to other similar units, and in these relationships it necessarily is subject to the demands of right, and of the welfare of *all* the parties involved in the relationship. The *solidarity* which subsists as between state and state automatically elevates the interstate relationship on the height of the moral plane and creates serious obligations on behalf of each state to the rest of its fellows. Therefore the state has no right, by putting forth the plea of necessity, to pit the claims of selfishness against the claims of solidarity and moral obligation. Germany's violation of the neutrality of Belgium, Serbia's complicity in the assassination of the Austrian heir to the throne, Russia's and England's exploitation of Persia, the unscrupulous conduct of the Roman emperors, the immoderate ambitions of Louis XIV and Napoleon, all these are glaring instances of application of the doctrine that the state dictates right but is not itself subject to it. Animals are non-moral agents, but they are ani-

mals, and to rise beyond morals is to fall to the level of the brute; to evolve higher and higher is to penetrate further and further into the field of moral considerations. To understand the situation in this light is to realize that a prime task of humanity is the creation of a *moral consciousness of the state*, in other words, the moralization of the state, in order that in the future its actions may be determined in accordance with the demands of duty and the sense of right and wrong.

Thus, we complete our discussion of the validity of the concept of the state, and we may summarize as follows:—Against our plan to organize humanity in terms of a federation of all states it has been protested that the units of the federation should not be states, for states have proved injurious to the best interest of humanity, as follows: I. States have tended to crush the individual and his freedom. II. They have sowed dissensions among men and violated all moral considerations, by setting up fictitious claims to goods of their own and pretences to emancipation from individual needs and usages. Consequently humanity must dispense with the organization of the state. Against this position we have argued as follows: (I) Society in a sense possesses an indefinable personality of its own, not reducible to a mere sum of individual personalities—therefore its good and interests are not completely calculable on the basis of the interests of its members taken severally. (II) The state is a particular embodiment of the social personality, with respect to the mutual relationship of its members in terms of their natural rights, and as such the state is a normal product in the evolution of society. Therefore, the state stands for a reality as such and constitutes an organism which must be recognized and dealt with in all discussion as to the co-ordination of the forces of humanity, a reality which cannot

be ignored, treated as a mere convention or tossed lightly aside as if it were an abnormal phenomenon. (III) We further suggested that in pronouncing judgment the state should not be condemned *per se*, on the basis of ill consequences which may have resulted from its employment, unless such consequences have issued from its very nature and are essential to it. After careful consideration, we concluded that the defects in the employment of the organization of the state are due to the fact that the state is yet in the early stages of its evolution, and hence that such defects are accidental and not permanently bound to it; that (IV) a state, instead of necessarily opposing the liberty of its members, on the contrary should tend to conserve it and furnish a soil for its effective use; that (V) the good of the state, (a) instead of being opposed to the good of its members, on the contrary is fulfilled most perfectly when embracing the fulfillment of all individual goods; that the same interest of the state (b) instead of being exclusive of the interests of the other states, receives its satisfaction through the medium of a common satisfaction of the interests of all states, and that consequently, not divisions and war, but co-operation and federation make up the natural atmosphere from which the state may draw nourishment (VI); finally, that the state, in so far as it sustains relation with other organic units, individuals as well as states,—all of which are bound by bonds of solidarity with each other—the state, we say, comes under the sway of the moral imperative, and is under the obligation to regulate its acts in accordance with moral standards. In so far as the state has failed to keep true to its own ideal thus analyzed, it has wandered off the narrow path, and must be guided back into wisdom.

3. We have agreed after laborious discussion that the units of our federation must be states, and we have laid

down the two conditions that (a) the state should not actively or passively oppose the good of its members, and (b) that the state should be a moral agent. A third condition is that the members of the society embodied in the state should all be of the same nationality; in other words, that the dividing lines between states should run parallel with those of nationality. No nation should be made or kept subject to another nation; any given nation's rights are equal to the right of any other given nation, and *no one nation* has the right to pry into the private affairs of another. All nations must be awarded a co-ordinate ranking in the general federation, for otherwise the union can lay no claim to permanency and to immunity from germs of war. A nation feels to its very core its right to be free in the world of its own affairs, and will without doubt fight, if deprived of the enjoyment of that right, until it secures possession of its freedom. War is indeed right when it is the only alternative to slavery, and war is unavoidable in a situation which involves the subjection of one nation to another. Consequently, to prevent war, we must eliminate the said situation. Now, as our federation is intended to form an organization from which war will be excluded, the union must respect the rights of each nation to freedom, and must be established on the basis of "one nation, one unit," or at least, in case one state embraces more than one nation, as in Switzerland, all nations in that state must enjoy equal rights with respect to each other. The grounds on which this condition is based are (I) considerations of right, as we have just seen, (II) considerations of expediency. With respect to both we may add that the principle of *domination* has been tried throughout history as a means of organizing nations into a unity, but there is no doubt that the verdict is against it, because (a) domination is immoral, in that it in-

volves violation of the rights of the subject nation, and (b) an organization in terms of domination is unstable and is destined to die, for the reason that the subject nation will one day reassert its right and will overturn the dominant nation. Turkey, a few centuries ago, was an immense empire embracing many different peoples under its sway. Nowadays, it has shrunk into a mere fraction of its former size and is in imminent danger of going out of existence. The system of Imperialism bears within itself the seeds of decay.

These considerations are especially pertinent in view of the situation created by the Great War. That peace will be an illusory and fugitive peace which will set its seal on the apportionment of this and that people as prizes to the victor. The custom of regarding persons as property dates from the epoch of our savage ancestors. Now, it is fast dying out before the active assertion by the individual of his inalienable right to freedom. The custom of reducing *groups* of persons into property is a similarly savage custom, but, unfortunately, has not yet died out. But it is beginning to expire, and it will die completely when the truth has been fully realized that no spiritual unit may be possessed, exploited, or deprived of authority over its own actions, and that humanity's only legitimate possession is the collection of forces of Nature outside and about it. *We therefore definitely provide against union through domination and stand for organization in terms of equal rights for all nations.* Federation in such fashion may claim approval not only on the negative ground that no member of the group will be provided with cause to complain on the score of curtailment or deprivation of rights, but on the positive ground as well that the federation will endow each nation with a wide field for self-development by making available

for its use the machinery of an all-pervasive co-operative activity.

I. But at this juncture we are met with protests from a different quarter, namely, the group of people consisting of the advocates of cosmopolitanism. By this party, stress is laid on the historical fact that the division of humanity into different races has been a fruitful source of wars and dissensions in general, and it is argued, as a result, that humanity should take means to transcend the variations of nationality and unite itself into one comprehensive society. "My country is the whole world, and my nation is humanity"—so runs their slogan. Now, to start with, we must distinguish this view from the other, already discussed, which maintains that the component groups of humanity should be organized on a basis other than the fabric of the state. The latter enters no protest against the fact of the multiplicity of nations, but opposes their organization into states; the doctrine of cosmopolitanism, on the other hand, approves of the state, but not of the variety of the nations; in sum, it demands the constitution of all members of humanity under an all-embracing state, where "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free." Such an ideal possesses undoubtedly many attractions for the pacifist and indeed for any genuine altruist. One who senses one's solidarity with all others feels profoundly dissatisfied with that spirit of nationality which directs the sentiment of patriotism to one's own country only, preventing the attachment of loyalty to nations other than one's own. Nevertheless, we feel that cosmopolitanism is neither a desirable nor a practicable ideal.

II. (a) As to the evils of nationality, we agree that they are serious, but not such as to justify a final decision pro or con. Variety of nations implies the fact of *distinction*,

but not necessarily *opposition*. Differences exist, but differences are not divisions, much less need they cause mutual repulsion. Such patriotism which demands hatred of foreign countries is a bad and unworthy sentiment. But patriotism need not be egotistic; if, thus far, it has tended to be exclusive in spirit, education is called for to train people to feel such a love toward their own countries, respectively, as will not entail ignorance of, indifference to, or hatred of, other countries. In other words, there is no warrant for condemning nationalism in principle for the abuse for which it has been made a tool. There is undeniably the possibility of a morally higher and more comprehensive spirit of nationalism, to which humanity should aspire.

(b) The ideal of unity in *homogeneity* is absolutely unsatisfactory; *variety* is necessary as well as unity. The spirit of nationality expresses the individuality of the group, and individuality means difference because it means originality. This world would surely be a humdrum sort of a habitation if all men had been completely similar in physical appearance and in point of mental traits. It would moreover lose not only its charm, but most of its efficiency as well. So, each nation, by preserving its individual identity, contributes something all its own, something original, something which cannot be otherwise brought about, to the common stock. The federation of humanity, by letting each nation give its own individual mite, will be the richer in capital and in profits, and the unity thus achieved will be analogous to a visual harmony of all the different colors, in contrast to the neutral homogeneity of the simple grey.

(c) With respect to the position that the sentiment of loyalty should be directed to humanity as a whole instead of to each country we point out that as a matter of psychological necessity an emotion loses its force if spread out and

directed on too broad and vague an object. A sentiment must be concentrated in order that it be strong, and its object must be consequently concrete and individual. I. The natural group therefore is called upon to serve precisely as a lens to focalize man's sentiment of loyalty to all human beings, so that one may love all humanity in loving one's own nation. II. From the moral point of view, the rock of solidarity upon which the fabric of humanity is founded must receive support from pillars not of individuals as such, but of groups of individuals, i. e., of nations. III. The same arrangement of division in groups assures more efficiency in action. A collection of individuals, to be effective, must be appropriately small in numbers, in order to facilitate exchange and in general mutual communications between the members. Humanity can pursue the satisfaction of its ideal needs only by subdividing itself into collective units each of which will concentrate its energies upon a concrete task and labor to execute it. Patriotism is indeed an immense force which must not be shackled or killed, but be reformed and directed into right channels; through patriotism to his country, an individual is led even to sacrifice his life for the good of his own nation, and indirectly for the good of humanity.

The above considerations, namely, (a) that nationality is not necessarily a disruptive force, neither patriotism a selfish sentiment; (b) that the multiplicity of nationalities introduces the useful elements of variety and individuality into the make up of humanity; (c) that nationality does not break human solidarity, but, on the contrary, expresses it in a particular fashion, and (d) that the distribution of people into nationalities contributes to concentrate and crystallize the disposition of each individual to serve humanity, and helps to increase the measure of efficiency in the realization

of this service—the above considerations we repeat, lead to the conclusion that the elimination of nationality as a factor in human life is undesirable. The following and final consideration is intended to show that the project of the elimination of nationality is *impracticable* as well; that, in other words, the doctrine of cosmopolitanism inevitably breaks to pieces on the hard rock of the natural instincts.

III. At no time has the spirit of nationality asserted itself in more vigorous manner than at the present. The joining of the individual's fortune with the fortunes of a given group happens instinctively and not conventionally. The bond of nationality is a fact which must be reckoned with as a force to be brought under useful control, and any project to destroy it by violence seems destined to fail. And further, it is an admitted fact that considerations of geography are fundamental in the shaping of the traits and features of man. Now, owing to the difference of climatic and topographic conditions upon the surface of the earth, men are naturally differentiated into tribal and racial groups, each with its own special characteristics traceable in their origin, respectively, to the peculiarity of the geography of their habitation. Now, race is the chief, though not the sole, constituent factor in nationality, and consequently, since these geographical differences in the soil and climate can never be obliterated to any appreciable extent, distinction into national groups seems to be a natural and unavoidable process. Thus, from both of the above points of view, it becomes evident that the ideal of cosmopolitanism, or of the abolition of nationality, cannot be realized.

4. We stand therefore approved, by ourselves, at least, and by our readers, we hope, as to our initial position that the state-unit will be conserved in the federation, and that the state will be organized on the basis of nationality. We will

now consider how the federation will serve to prevent the occurrence of wars, an event which we have concluded is unnecessary and undesirable, and how, if wars arise, the federation will deal with them. We have urged that the federation will embody the ideal of co-operation as against the ideal of mutual conflict, but an ideal, we must remember, is not identical with an attainment, and there will always be a falling short of the ideal, to a varying extent. Organization will be the rule and recognition of the rights of the other states the normal attitude, but the condition of war will not be excluded as a possibility or as a fact; nevertheless, the occurrence of war will be within the bounds of expectation solely as an *exception*, a violation of the accepted custom and of the prescribed law. Hence the establishment of federation, although not implying necessarily the cessation of war, will mean making of it an abnormal occurrence, from the legal as well as from the purely natural point of view, to be dealt with as it arises. What, then, will be the attitude of the federation toward the problem of war; how, we repeat, will it aim to prevent its occurrence?

(a) The machinery of federation will be objectified through a legislative assembly, a judicial tribunal, and an executive body, the personnel of all of which will possess an international character. Now, war, to a large extent, arises as a protest against injustice, but the federation, because of its transcendence of strictly national bonds, will be enabled to treat all states fairly and impartially. The governing assemblies will, it is presumed, owing to their international character, give attention to the needs of each state in the union, and as far as is humanly possibly endeavor to satisfy the legitimate demands of each state and prevent the exploitation of one state by another. (b) Through its representative legislative assembly, in particular, the federation

will labor toward the creation of a comprehensive system of law relating to the mutual adjustment of the rights of all states, and bearing in general on all interstate situations, so as to anticipate any difficulty which might arise between states or indicate by anticipation the method of its solution.

(c) A fruitful cause of wars and desire for wars at the present is admittedly the fact that each state is armed to its very teeth with appropriate tools of defense and offense, so that, the instrument being ready and fit, the disposition to put the instrument to use is fanned and intensified. The tool runs away, so to speak, with the hand which uses it, and the state becomes hypnotized by the size and strength of its armaments into a mental state which compels it to provoke a situation in which the armaments may be employed as intended. Moreover, given that one state is more strongly armed than another state, the former will always be tempted to attack the latter with aggressive purposes. Now, in the Union of the States, as planned, no individual state will be permitted to equip itself with either an army or a navy. The state will, of course, possess its own police force for the purpose of maintaining order within its borders, but not any armed force whose field of operation may lie outside the borders of the state itself, in the sphere of its relations with other states. For, obviously, this sphere of the relations among states is an interstate affair and a matter to be controlled and regulated by the Federal authorities. In acknowledgment of the same principle, under the present system of government, individuals within a state are forbidden to carry arms on their persons, respectively, as instruments of offense or defense, and it is the state itself which is expected to deal with the situation relatively to the adjustment of the rights of one with the rights of other individuals. Now, since similarly, offense and defense, when the parties concerned are

states, are affairs exceeding the jurisdiction of the individual state as such, the authority and agency to deal with the situation will be taken out of the hands of the latter, and be vested in those of the general union. In this way, a particular cause of war, consisting in the intoxication of the state by the possession of excessive armaments, will be eliminated.

(d) The creation of law does not as such insure its own enforcement, and, no matter how many possible pretexts for engaging in warfare are done away with, the states will in all probability be apt, oftentimes, to trample on each other's rights, and thus create situations where vigorous action by the Federal authorities will be necessary. Under this heading, therefore, we will consider punitive measures for the prevention of war, which will aim more specifically to both prevent the occurrence of war at all and to bring war to a stop when it has once begun. To this purpose, the government of the federation will maintain a judicial tribunal which will judge between all states among whom differences may arise, and, when an actual offense has been committed against the law, will cause punishment to be administered to the offender.

The instruments of punishment will be twofold—economic pressure and the use of armed force. The former will consist in the maintenance of a commercial boycott against the offending state, enforced, if necessary, by the establishment of a blockade by the sea, and the placing of an adequate force of frontier guards on land, the prohibition of the granting of any credit to the state in its financial transactions, and in general cutting off of all business on the part of the rest with the said state. The use of armed force will be effected whenever occasion arises by the sending of a sufficient portion of the Federal army or navy or both to the precincts of the offending state and by threatening to compel the latter to com-

ply with law by force. If the state refuses to yield, the military force will invade the state and take all necessary measures until the state agrees to subject itself to the Federal authority and comply with the rulings of the judicial tribunal.

At this point we are confronted with a vehement protest issuing from the party of extreme pacifists, to the effect that our remedial measures are half or no measures and that we foolishly propose to end war by adding more to it, and that though armed force has been decried as the bane of humanity, such force is still suggested for employment. To this we reply (a) that we decidedly do not propose to end war through war. The use of armed force constitutes war *when, and only when*, the parties engaged in using the force are individual states settling their quarrels among themselves; but when force is used by an independent organization for the purpose of the administration of justice such use constitutes not warfare, but punishment. Once the federation is established, any actual offense committed will be directed not against this or that state, but against the Federal law; there will be a case not of a state defending itself, but of the law putting itself to rights. In other words, war as an armed conflict occurs in a situation anteceding the establishment of law, a situation where the relation between the states is personal, so to speak, and arbitrary, and where the force is used in the ends of revenge for a wrong inflicted, or of the satisfaction of aggressive instincts; but where once the domain of the relation between states is recognized officially as constituting a sphere of law and where once the task of re-establishing the disturbed equilibrium between the states is taken out of the hands of the parties immediately concerned and made the business of an independent mechanism acting as the instrument of the law, there and then, we repeat, war

is put out of court and we have to do with merely judicial settlements.

(b) The objection, secondly, takes the form of a protest against any recognition whatever of force as an instrument in the hands of law. Here we have to do with extreme pacifists, like, e. g., W. J. Bryan, who, it may be remembered, has criticized in public speech the proposal of eminent statesmen like William Taft and Theodore Roosevelt to limit armaments as to size but not to dispense with their use altogether.

But why, we ask in return, should one object to force *per se*? In this world nothing is bad unless it is put to a bad use. Force is not bad, but the use of it may be bad according as the aim of the use is bad. Force is an actual factor in Nature; now a factor as such is morally indifferent, and it acquires moral significance only as it relates itself to a controlling agent; *then*, it becomes bad if it negates the said control and becomes unbridled. Thus, none of the human instincts is bad as such; they become bad, as, e. g., the sexual instinct, when indulged in to an excess, that is to say, when they get the better of the human agent and run out of hand, but when under proper restraint, all instincts are legitimate. This truth, we know, is a platitude, but it is a truth apt to be forgotten at times. So, Physical force, if under the control of reason, is a good and useful instrument; it becomes bad when it reverses the order and dictates to reason, when it makes right instead of obeying it, when, in short, it becomes the master where it normally is the servant.

Let us extend the scope of the argument. Man, in his relation to any natural element, aims not to destroy, but to take in hand. The wind may blow too hard for man to withstand, it may tear down the houses he has built and the ships on the sea; now, the reasonable attitude to take is not to discard wind as an instrument for the ends of man and treat it as

something to be shunned and avoided, but on the contrary to labor to bring it more and more within effective control. Primitive man, to be sure, took the opposite attitude and regarded the forces of Nature as objects of fear and hatred, but primitive man has the excuse of ignorance, and the modern pacifist has not. Our dictum that "force (armed or not) is an instrument," enters a protest as such against the doctrine of both the extreme militarist and the extreme pacifist. As against the former it insists that force is a tool, something to serve and not to be served; thus, as against Nietzsche, it insists that force is not a god to be worshipped, but rather a wild beast to be subdued and a weapon to be wielded. And, as against the extreme pacifists, the dictum insists that force is a legitimate tool, that it may be used, that force should not be scouted, but be made a servant to the ideal of the spirit. In short, two alternatives are placed before the individual agent, either let the force rule over you or *rule* over the force. Of these, the first is undesirable and mischievous in results, if selected, whereas the second is desirable and good, and in our world of federated states, where force will be maintained as the tool of the law, we will certainly cast the lot for the latter alternative.

5. Before we put an end to this general section, it will be well to set our plan into greater relief by placing it in contrast with other schemes calculated to control or end war, and to exhibit the difference between the elements of the situation now and of that to be realized through the plan as herein proposed.

(a) As things are now, the issues lying before a state are limited to war and peace, and very often with justice found on the side of war. A given country which perceives right violated protests in vain unless it is ready and able to fight the offending party with prospects of victory. For that

country, war, with all its horrors, will be preferable to peace. But when the relation between the states has been incorporated into the sphere of law to be administered by a Federal government, the state which suffers will not itself be called upon to fight, and justice will be executed by an impartial tribunal through infliction of the necessary punishment upon the offender. Whereas in the first case the application of force is an *interested* act, in that it is made by the injured party for purposes of self-defense or self-revenge, and consequently entails the arousal of all the passions of hatred and fury such as are raging now on the soil of the belligerent countries in Europe. In the latter case the use of force will be a disinterested act, accompanied by the excitement of no animosity or passions. In short, we convert the issue of war and peace into one of justice and injustice, and, accepting the presupposition that justice is to be preferred, aim to create a situation where justice will not mean war as well.

(b) We may also contrast our plan with the plan which relies chiefly on the employment of arbitration as a remedy against war. The latter, in some cases, presupposes a situation where the states are absolute units, with no legal organization to control the sphere of their relations, especially as concerns warfare between them. The states merely agree to refer their quarrel to a third and neutral party for adjudication, but, if they are not so disposed, they may not agree. Even in the case of compulsory arbitration, the affair is primarily a matter between the states themselves, a quarrel or a reconciliation, and it consists merely in an attempt to settle the difference otherwise than through war. Hague tribunals and other courts of arbitration are useful so far as they go, but they do not go very far, even in point of principle, because they deal with the war situation as if it is an affair of

the individual states as such, in effect viewing the states in too pluralistic a fashion, without recognizing the organic unity, the real whole, transcending the states as such, but constituted by their mutual inter-relationship.

On the other hand, according to the plan of the establishment of a general federation, the adjudication of the differences between states is not, strictly speaking, an act of arbitration, but rather a case of the administration of law; it is a matter not of satisfying the interests of the state as such, but of maintaining the fabric of justice. Just as in an organism matters concerning the adjustment of the functions of cells with each other relate to the interest, not of the cells as such, but of the tissues which they form or the general organism constituted thereby, so within the federation the situation will lie on a plane above that of the parties directly concerned, and its settlement will be controlled by the action of a self-regulating mechanism restoring itself to a state of normal functioning.

With these remarks we conclude our reply to the question propounded in the beginning of this chapter with reference to the theoretical problem as to the nature of the desirable ideal for the relation of the peoples and as to the places of war in the plan of that ideal. We have said that co-operation on the basis of a federation of states established on the lines of nationality, possessing legislative, judicial and executive authority over all matters pertaining to the relation of state to state, a co-operation allowing rational and useful competition, but excluding the waging of warfare, is the desirable and practicable ideal. The Federal government will consider any infringement of the rights of a given state as a violation of the Federal law, and treat the act punitively by the employment of economic pressure or armed force, and

in general will adjudicate all points at dispute between states through rulings of a federal judicial tribunal.

Our reply to the first question, as already given, is at once a partial reply to our second question as to the practical means to attain the ideal. Our reply registers, e. g., one way to avoid war through the setting up of interstate legal authority; it discusses whether the machinery of the state is useful or not relatively to the question of the causation of war, and whether nationality must be suppressed in the end of killing the germs of animosity between men. Consequently it will take much less space to expound our specific reply to the second question. But before we actively engage ourselves with the task, some general remarks may prove to the point.

(I) There is no doubt that at the present the subject of war and its prevention, and the establishment of peace, is engaging more attention than ever, and there is no doubt, as well, that the increase in the amount of attention is due to the actual fact of the terrible conflict waged by so many of the nations of the world against each other. Now, serious danger always arises whenever discussion of a certain topic takes its start from actual experience of the fact discussed, and for the following reason: An object cannot be seen in its true proportion if looked at from too short a distance, so that, given the latter, too much stress is apt to be laid on unimportant features. Let us see how this principle works in its effects upon the discussion now carried on about the topic of war.

(a) Any one who has followed the discussion with some care will have been struck with the inordinate degree of emphasis laid on the subject of the horrors of war and of the evils of which it is the cause. The chief argument directed against war is based on the fact that war is very injurious to

humanity, causes great pain, much material loss, and a large waste of life. Now, a little dose of psychological insight would pronounce this procedure an ineffective method of battling against war. The most effective means to inhibit a given process is not to take direct measures to curb that process, but to initiate another process in a direction contrary to that of the first. To illustrate: the surest way to stop the flow of water in a certain direction is not to build up a dam facing against the direction of its flow, but to open up another channel in which to *divert* its flow. Similarly, the most efficient educational propaganda should concern itself specifically not with pointing out the evils of war, but with occupying the mind with the advantages of co-operation and the good of enlightened nationalism. Because we human folk are now engaged in the process of war, its *results* occupy the focus of our consciousness, and it is against the *results* that we are aiming our criticism; but naturally, when the war is over, and the time comes when we will not be experiencing the results immediately, or will at least feel them with less intensity, the former arguments which actually depended for their force upon the felt evils of the war, will lose their force and old self-same desires will spring up again, virile and strong and perhaps overwhelming.

In general, to lay stress on the evil results of a certain instinct or practice, is not the best means to put an end to the exercise of that instinct or practice, for as soon as the actual, acute experience of the results is eliminated and the field is free the latent desire reasserts itself and tends to shatter at once the weak walls built to bar the progress of its flow. To apply this to our case, consciousness of the warring instinct is accompanied by consciousness of the results of the instinct only at the moment when the latter is actually indulged in and given free rein, but not *before*; we need, however, an

agency which will inhibit the instinct, not after, but before it is indulged in. Now, it is only by the opening up of a new path that the old can be closed securely; the new channel being given, the current of force is switched off from the old into the new, so that by this process of drainage, the first instinct is automatically deprived of its power to impel and attract. Put in general terms, the positive method of attack is more effective than the *negative* method, and this truth must be impressed upon the minds of the many well-meaning propagandists who content themselves with harping continually on the amount of distress and loss for which war is responsible.

(b) Any discussion of the merits of a situation which (discussion) is suggested by the actual experiencing of the situation itself is usually accompanied by a failure to perceive things from a true perspective, not only in the sense that the negative is given more importance than the positive, but in that a general confusion as to the issues involved is sure to follow. You find that now the issue is expressed by many in terms of the two alternatives, war or peace, or again, violent or peaceful solution of conflicts, acceptance of the latter alternative being urged at the same time. And the convinced disciple, when faced with a situation demanding a fight for the sake of justice or the use of force in the ends of law, is thrown at once into dire perplexity and may actually cast the vote for peace even when peace involves the sacrifice of justice. Indeed, have not we had already occasion to consider the protests directed against any use of violent measures by the Federal authority for the purpose of punishment on the ground that the said use of violence will disturb the sway of peace? Such protests, we have said, issue from people who are confused in their own minds as to the true issue. The real alternatives before us are the *ren-*

dering of justice or not, and not the prevalence of peace or not. The question is not whether war or peace exist as between two states, but whether the one does or does not stand in rightful relation toward the other, and the other to the one; the primary task is the satisfaction of the demands of justice and the reinstatement of injured rights, and upon this level arises the question as to whether this task may not be accomplished without warfare or the use of armed force. To call oneself a pacifist is to take the cue from the militarist and move on his own level of thought, though in an opposite direction; more correctly, we should be not pacifists, advocates of peace, as such, *but rather advocates of justice, of organization and of the maintenance of law.*

(II) Let us, secondly, realize that the soil on which the practical patriot and humanitarian are to work lies in the cavity of the recesses of the soul, so that to bring about the application of the desirable ideal one has essentially to take account of and deal with desires, deep-rooted instincts, inhibitions, ideas, philosophical beliefs, sentiments, in a word, *mental processes*. If there is to be a change, it will be a change of the heart primarily, of dispositions, and of the intellect, of accepted views and convictions. Consequently the positive work of meeting the situation must consist in the use of forces tending to change the mental point of view and to create a public opinion enlightened in the way desired. All other means are bound to be merely external and hence futile. The mechanism of the court of arbitration, of international parliaments, the structure of enlightened legislation and the rest, will be of no avail, unless the soul of man is disposed to make use of the machinery and to obey the law. In this respect Mr. Roosevelt is justified in urging against all schemes of comprehensive and compulsory arbitration of disputes between states that if public opinion is not prepared

to abide by the agreements, and Mr. Roosevelt thinks it is not, such schemes are futile and worse than futile, because the conclusion of agreements, by which the parties to the agreement are temperamentally unable to abide, breeds dishonesty and disregard for solemn promises. Undoubtedly, in order that any new mechanism of conciliation and co-operation be built up and operated, there must be readiness and ability on the part of the public to work the mechanism.

2. Now, then, the above are the maxims which should guide all efforts at a practical solution of the difficulty, namely, (a) emphasis should be laid on positive rather than on negative measures; (b) the issues should be clearly distinguished and their relative importance ascertained, and (c) the essentially psychological nature of the problem should be recognized. Let us meanwhile acknowledge that work in the negative direction, though secondary to and presupposing work in the positive direction, is nevertheless important and useful. Hence we will advocate employment of both positive and negative measures in the end of realizing the federation as suggested.

Now, on the one hand, the positive contribution to the solution of the problem will consist in the building up of all the psychic habits of action, of sentiment and of thought which are presupposed in the erection and maintenance of the structure of the Federal union; on the other hand, the *negative* contribution will consist in the elimination of all factors working against the realization of this end, and, since war is the strongest factor opposing the co-operative spirit and the practice of federation, the said negative contribution to the solution will consist in the employment of measures to eliminate war itself, if possible. We will begin with the discussion of the negative.

(1) In hitting upon measures to stop war, we should not

let ourselves be hurried; change is slow and a natural process takes its own time. Short of the best, we should be content with the better, with the good, even with the less worse, welcoming eagerly any movement ahead that we note, using even half measures where full measures are inapplicable. And secondly, in a situation concerning steps to be taken by all nations together, it will be unwise to wait until the last laggard has, on his own accord, expressed his willingness to follow suit. Humanity stands in need of leaders who will forge ahead of the rank and file, who will set examples and push the scheme through with vigor, who will urge the others by all forces of persuasion to prosecute the forward train, and in extreme circumstances even compel them to enter the line. Let us now examine, in their proper order, the steps to be taken, beginning with those easiest of application and the least radical, and following with those that are most revolutionary.

(a) Mr. W. J. Bryan has proposed that, in every case, a year be set aside for discussion, whenever any acute difference arises between two states, before a final decision is taken. The proposal takes account of the fact that hurry engenders excitement and serves to inflame the violent passions, whereas reason operates with deliberation and takes its own time; thus, it is clear that Austria, which had made up its mind to fight Serbia, purposely assigned a very short time limit for the handing in by the latter of a reply to her ultimatum, and later refused to extend the said limit, because she anticipated that her plan would probably be thwarted in case this were done.

Nevertheless, to agree in general to set aside any definite amount of time—say a year—during which decision will be withheld, is of doubtful value, for the reason that some calls brook no delay and some situations are urgent in na-

ture, and require immediate attention. It has already been pointed out by others that if a state takes occupation by force of, say, a foreign island, the year's interval of breathing-spell will afford it ample time to fortify the position securely so that the party injured, will, at the expiration of the interval, find that its hands are completely tied. But although it is unwise to lay down set rules about the matter, the general principle underlying the suggestion should be heeded and deliberation and decision should never be rushed.

(b) A second suggestion is to the effect that committees of reconciliation be appointed which will make available their good offices for two or more states which find themselves at odds with each other. It is oftentimes true that the states directly involved in a dispute are so inflamed with passion, that, for them, cool reasoning and mutual comprehension become impossible—and then the labors of a neutral committee which would serve as a go-between, a mediator, or a conciliator, would be necessary and fruitful. Of course, this step goes to a very short distance, for a state which is determined to fight will contemptuously toss aside the overtures of such a committee; yet the parties are not uncompromising always, and in many cases of difference between states the requisite element is not so much agreeing mutually on legal and technical points, but possessing the proper disposition to agree and taking the attitude of conciliation. It is in such situations that the committee as proposed will furnish useful service tending to infuse a congenial atmosphere and the spirit of compromise into the surroundings.

(c) It is further suggested that complete disarmament be immediately decided upon by all states. This proposal takes account of the fact that working for and producing instruments for a given end kindles the impulse to make use

of the instrument by creating a situation where such use will be necessary, so that, similarly, possession by a state of the instruments of warfare impels the state to go to war in order to put the weapon to use. And then, of course, it is tacitly presupposed that by removing the instrument we remove the capacity, as well as weaken the desire, to realize the end, i. e., war.

But surely the actual facts do not warrant this conclusion. (a) To take up the latter point—depriving the desire of its tool does not necessarily mean killing the desire itself or rendering it completely helpless. It is the *tool* which depends upon the desire—for the desire creates the tool—and not the desire upon the tool. The desire—provided that it is strong—will strive to invent some other means, of whatever nature, in order to secure its own fulfilment. The method of disarmament is too external to warrant much hope in the successful issue of its application.

And (b) supposing, when once complete disarmament has been agreed upon and effected, that a state in some way or other insults, injures, or violates the honor and rights of another state, and it is necessary that punishment be inflicted and justice be rendered. If the guilty state is recalcitrant and obstinate, force will probably be necessary to bring it to reason, and so the question arises, how will that force be secured? Indeed, supposing the said state had been engaged in the secret manufacture of arms and ammunition, will not the other states, when the critical moment arrives, be caught unawares and forced to bend the knee in helpless acquiescence to the arrogant transgression of the agreement? Optimism is good, but too much of it is not justified, and we must always provide for the worst; we cannot rely too confidently upon the trustworthiness of every state, and there is always the possibility of a violation

of a treaty of disarmament. When the United States of the World is an accomplished fact, all individual states will be disarmed, but there will exist instead an efficient body of police—consisting of an army and a navy—under the authority of the federal government. And until the U. S. W. is realized it is necessary to allow states to be armed to a certain extent. However, there is no justification for the enormous degree in which states have armed themselves at the present time, and it is imperative in the ends of peace, that the size of armaments be limited by common agreement, the extent to which each state is to be armed being determined in proportion to the State's size in number of inhabitants and in territory. Under this provision, if a given state happens to violate the rule, the rest of the states will be in a position, by uniting their arms together, to present a mailed fist strong enough to intimidate, or, if necessary, to compel the culprit to submission. But it must be understood that armaments thus limited in size, will be allowed to continue in being, for a long time at least, as instruments of punishment and reparation, until the better days have dawned.

(d) After all is said and done, arbitration remains as the most efficient means to apply in the circumstances of our age. It is not an ideal means, by far, as we shall soon see; however, it is, most probably, the best available. But the machinery of arbitration must be made more perfect than the one already in force, if it is to be effective; the existing machinery has not been able to stop the Great War and we are looking for something which will not break down in the face of great crisis. The Hague Court of Arbitration has of course been very useful, and Mr. Carnegie, in his essay on "The League of Peace," is authority for the statement, if we correctly remember, that more than a hundred wars

have been killed in the womb, through the ministrations of the court; nevertheless, the deplorable fact remains that a *number* of wars have broken out despite the court. Now, what are the requisite improvements? We should first enlarge international law in point of scope, make it clearer, fuller, more explicit. The law as such is of no avail as a preventive of war, but in the wake of more powerful currents it proves to be quite serviceable. Hence, let there be established a permanent assembly whose function it will be to legislate as necessary, and to keep the body of the law up to date. Secondly, and much more important, there must be established a permanent court of arbitration. Two measures here are of conspicuous significance; (a) the resort to arbitration must be compulsory, and (b) the judgment of the court must be binding upon all states. And here is the crux; is humanity ready to put these measures into force?

To take up the first—all states should sign treaties by which to pledge themselves to refer to arbitration any justifiable point of dispute arising between them, and which cannot be settled by the usual diplomatic channels of negotiation. And, furthermore, the states in general should agree to *compel* any state to fulfil the provisions of the said treaty if the state fails to do so of its own accord. Now, the conclusion of such treaties between all states will be a very difficult matter, as there are bound to be a few states holding back, and in this connection the suggestion which we made some paragraphs above is in point. We need *leaders* among the states who will be in the van and urge and compel the rest to follow. Mr. Roosevelt has proposed that the great powers of the world conclude agreements among themselves to refer to arbitration all justifiable matters of dispute arising between them, and further to combine in the formation of a league whose function it will be to compel the other

small states to make use of arbitration—if not all the great powers, at least, such a number of them as will bring together sufficient force to insure compliance by the rest with the scheme and workings of arbitration. The value of the suggestion lies in the fact that it provides for better progress than if *all* states had to agree together before arbitration began to be generally effective. Again, it will be difficult to make use of armed force composed of contingents contributed by every single state, and it will be more convenient to muster the forces from among the members of the league, as mentioned.

Our second point refers to compulsory acceptance of the verdicts of the arbitral court. Here, too, given a state which insists upon formal acceptance of its own side of the matter rather than of the version of the court, the rest of the states, or a league of the powers, should see to it that the verdict of the court is carried out. It must be remarked that though the suppression of war will be the result, such will not be the only and direct purpose of the general working of the court. The prime end of the machinery of arbitration, as just set forth, will be to award justice, and the avowed end of the executive league will be to enforce justice; and only when a state revolts against the decision of the court, or when, in contempt of court, it directs violent measures against another state, will resort be made to either economic pressure or armed force.

But at this juncture we are confronted with a very acute problem. Shall or shall not the jurisdiction of the court extend over *all and any* points of difference arising between two or more states,—or, to put it otherwise, will a state be called upon to arbitrate *any* matter which concerns it in its relation to the other states? Let us at once face the fact that unless no exception is made in the respect of the nature

of the matters over which the court will possess authority to arbitrate, we may as well despair of witnessing the ending of war; for any matter that we may exclude will very probably one day furnish the spark which will kindle the conflagration of war. Either we agree that arbitration should apply to all points of dispute between states, without exception, or otherwise we acquiesce in the possible and probable recurrence of war. We say "probable" intentionally, for if, say, questions of honor are to form the exception, a state may very easily put forth the claim of insult to its honor as a pretext to embark upon war against another state. Let us forthwith examine the questions which, it is declared by many, should be deemed non-arbitrable.

These may be summed up as (a) private and personal affairs of the state on the one hand, and (b) matters of honor, on the other. Self-defence is often urged by states as the purpose for which they engage in war, but self-defence will not furnish a possible pretext for war, when arbitration has been established as compulsory, for surely the court will be competent to pronounce judgment adversely to the state which conceives aggressive designs against its neighbors and engineers wars to secure occupation of foreign territory. (a) With respect to purely personal affairs of the state, Mr. Roosevelt has mentioned the Monroe Doctrine and the control by the government of the U. S. A. of the size and quality of immigration into this country. Mr. Roosevelt insists that these questions and possibly others relate to inalienable rights of the states concerned and consequently are not susceptible of arbitration. Now, in view of this allegation, some explanation is necessary. It must be kept in mind that the court of arbitration will possess no authority to interfere with the *internal* affairs of the state. It must be laid down that a country has a general right to

be master in its own house, and that this right will not be questioned, will not be even discussed by the court, for, let us note, the court of arbitration is to be not a destructive, but a conservative force, whose purpose will be the assurance to each state of the enjoyment of its rights. Consequently, no state will have reason to fear any loss of its individual rights through the comprehensive operation of the arbitral court. Thus, granted that the control of the influx of humanity from without into a given state is an internal affair of the said state in that such influx affects directly the internal situation of the country, whenever acknowledgment of such right is withheld, and attempt is made by another state to override such control, the court will simply consider and determine whether violation of the right of a state to manage its own affairs has occurred and give decision upon the merits of the results of the inquiry into this matter solely, without passing upon the question as to the wisdom of the act of the state itself in the particular control which it has assumed over immigration. In other words, regulating the control of immigration into a given country, by the country itself, provided it is a matter of internal interest for the state, is a right which will constitute a starting point for the court, and not a matter to be discussed. The provision that the matter is of private concern for the state is necessary, and if not fulfilled—that is to say, if the matter concerns the other states in equal degree or rather concerns the relation of the state to the other states, we do not see any warrant for exempting it from arbitration. We insist only that the court is to occupy itself with the affairs of the *relationship* between states, but not of the internal administration of the state.

It is but natural that the internal affairs of a state will make up a sanctum sanctorum into which none other but the

state itself may set foot, and the provision does not really imply excepting any matters from the jurisdiction of the court; on the contrary, it entails merely specifying the manner in which such matters will be dealt with. To summarize, the provision will be that whenever disputes arise out of refusal by one state to conform with the regulations of another state with respect to its own internal affairs, the court of arbitration will give verdict only as to whether such refusal has happened—considering the said refusal, whenever occurring, as a violation of right—and will in no wise consider whether the nature of the regulation by the state of its affairs is proper or not, or take action to impugn the validity of the regulation.

(b) We now take up the question of honor. Can a state, it is urged, conserve its dignity without striking back when its person is insulted and its honor besmirched? Does not the individual take the law into his own hands when the honor of his wife or sister is violated? How then can we expect the injured state to bring the matter into the notice of the arbitral court, and leave it there, content with the decision of a third party?

Well, opinion may vary, but for our part we do not see why the state should not satisfy itself with referring the matter to arbitration. President Wilson has finely said that there is something like being too proud to fight, and an individual, fully conscious of his dignity, may similarly disdain to wreak revenge through the employment of violence upon the wretch who has insulted him ever so vilely and brutally. A fine nature never stoops down to the same level from one which its unworthy foe has levelled his infamous shafts—never uses the same weapons, never pays the brute with the same coin. And so in regard to the sphere of states; we do not see why the interests of the dig-

nity of the insulted state should demand a direct violent attack upon the offender and why the state should not—content to let the processes of the arbitral court take their normal course—disdain to take notice of the wicked offender. To the sneer that the state which is too proud to fight will make easy food for its greedy enemy, we hasten to reply that we throughout presuppose this to be a matter *solely* of honor, and not of self-defense against foreign greed and aggression. But in case of self-defense, as well, we have seen that the league of the states will seize upon the guilty party and prevent forcibly the execution of its sinister designs.

And yet, even if insult to honor and interference with the internal administration of a state cease to constitute breeding places for the germs of war, there remains a third issue which seems to block unavoidably the path of completely comprehensive arbitration. We mean the following: (c) As conditions are nowadays, a number of nationalities are subject to the rule of other nationalities—an abnormal situation indeed, due to our sins of the past—and we may expect that some day the subject nations will make insistent demands in order to secure their lost independence. Supposing that the ruling states refuse to accede to their demands, is there any way to prevent the outbreak of war and bloodshed? The court of arbitration cannot but respect the law, and a state which possesses *de facto* control over the fortunes and affairs of a given nation has legal right to continue in the same possession. Legally, the court will be powerless to give judgment to the effect that the subject nation be granted the liberty, to which it possesses a moral right, by the ruling state, for the court cannot create legal rights or change their status; it only takes account of a situation, but is without means for altering the status quo.



WOODROW WILSON
PRESIDENT OF THE U. S.

And yet the subject nationality possesses from nature the inalienable right to freedom and it will be inhuman to prevent it from using all the forces at its command in the end of taking effective possession of that right. Thus, the court of arbitration can have authority neither to demand of a nation fighting for its freedom that it desist, and that it respect the master who has wooed her by force, nor to compel the latter to give up the reins and grant the subject nation her political independence. So, unless the ruling state, of its own accord, grants the desired freedom to the subject people, war, more specifically, a war of liberation, seems the only solution. Such war is unavoidable because, as matters stand, Turkey rules over a large section of discontented Greeks and Armenians, Russia reigns over the Finns, Britain over Hindoos, Germany over Poles and the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine—to mention only a few instances; and as the governing empires seem unwilling to forego control over their own wards, we may expect to see the disputes which will inevitably arise when the peoples in subjection awake to self-consciousness and become endowed with the adequate moral and physical force, settled on the soil of the battlefield. In short, we may as well admit that to all intents and purposes this war is not the last war, for of the two sides, although the side defeated may be made to forego its possessions, the victors, on the other hand, will be apt to tighten their grasp on their own; and let us keep in mind that the way of change and progress is rough, and that the states are bound to trip, and perhaps fall, as they move forward. Nevertheless, this situation will not continue indefinitely, and when once readjustment has been effected, even through war, and the nations have achieved their liberties respectively, the dangers of war issuing from this quarter will cease to exist.

We have agreed that arbitration is the most efficient expedient for the prevention of war, and yet, if we but look, how many difficulties do we not discover besetting its path? For one thing, have we the right to expect that *all* the states will agree to sign treaties of arbitration as suggested? Can we hope that, e. g., such a state as Germany will be of our mind, given that but a few years ago the Imperial Chancellor, Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, in a speech in the Reichstag, declared in so many words that efforts to insure the complete prevalence of peace are bound to be futile, and that war is a process inseparable from the life of a nation? And then, even if it be admitted in theory and principle that a state may resort to a court for the arbitration of a question of honor, without lowering its dignity in the least, shall we find the mass of the nations, in their present stage of development, in a mood to accept the judgment of a dispassionate intellect, that is to say, to feel as well as think rightly, and thus to agree to place under the jurisdiction of the court of arbitration *all* disputes arising between them? This reflection gives us occasion to repeat that the *negative* remedy depends on, and presupposes, the *positive* remedy, and that the external draws power to live from the internal; that unless the peoples are endowed with the requisite disposition, no plan, no measure, no mechanism, however perfect it may be as such, will succeed. Take the Monroe Doctrine; *now*, it constitutes a distinct issue, but supposing the nations co-operate to form a federation and agree to drop all designs of aggression altogether, each concentrating its efforts to the most thorough cultivation of its resources in unison with the rest, what need will there be for the said doctrine when there will be no fear that America may be made the object of military invasion or of exploitation by foreign governments? Under the new conditions such acts

and processes will automatically lose their significance, and in fact such terms as "occupation of territory" or "foreign political exploitations" will become meaningless. It must be noted that, given difficulties which appear insurmountable, and given problems for which the only solution seems war, or conditions in which justice seems to demand war, the establishment of federation will operate to remedy the ills not directly, but indirectly, by preventing the recurrence of those situations in which the said problems normally arise, by removing the ground from under the feet of the difficulties, so to speak.

(2) We return, therefore, lastly, to the most significant feature of this aspect of our discussion, namely, the question of the positive development of a spirit of co-operation and a sense of solidarity among the peoples, with the ultimate end of establishing the fabric of a United States of the World. We have said above that the soil upon which work is to be performed is physical rather than material. As we take our stand upon this point of view, we find ourselves baffled in our efforts, for, comparatively easy as it is to operate upon and fashion, the external, it is especially difficult to influence the internal. The depths of the soul are not directly accessible to external stimulus, and to a large extent we will have to trust Nature to take its own course.

Now, the condition we desire to have realized among the peoples consists of the right sort of mental attitude, the good will, the good feeling, the sensible opinion about the matter; and the bringing of this about will be the task of a world-wide movement of education in all branchings and situations of life, and by all possible means.

(a) The educational movement will firstly instill the right and proper convictions in the mind of the people. A Man's general point of view—his *weltanschauung*—usually deter-

mines the nature of his action and it is our duty to approach his soul first from that vantage-point. People therefore must be given to understand what we have urged in the opening pages of this chapter, namely, that war is not a necessity, neither is it a normal process in the life of the people—that when it arises it is more often due to the excessive control which the pugnacious instinct has assumed over the individual members of the race and as such is an abnormality, a symptom of atavism; that, as Mr. Norman Angell has undertaken to prove repeatedly, states, so intimately connected with each other as they are, are bound to lose in point of their economic resources through the waging of mutual conflict, and that the victor in the war suffers as well as the party defeated, because no state is completely self-sufficient and self-supporting; that a country, even if through victory it adds to its territory at the expense of that of the neighboring state, gains nothing thereby—the old conception of war as plunder being rendered old-fashioned through the progress of modern conditions, so that in the present stage of civilization, whichever state may govern a given country, the property remains in the hands of the individual private holders; that when a difficulty arises, the way to settle it is through appeal to reason and ultimately to law rather than through direct appeal to force; that when nations co-operate in economic and cultural tasks the benefits are mutual; that loyalty to one's own country does not demand ill-will for the countries of others respectively, because no one nation's real good can be secured at the price of another nation's real loss; that beyond the good of each nation as such there lies another and greater good, the good of all the nations together—of humanity—and that therefore nations should organize themselves into a co-operative union whose aim will be to pro-

mote that common good and to suppress the currents which naturally oppose it. To those who cannot understand the language of altruism we must speak the language of interest and make clear that it is always to the mature interest of the state, sometimes in the short and always in the long run, to enter into agreements with other states, to work with them in harmony, not to put obstacles before their path to prosperity, but to find its own good in that of all the others.

(b) And by thus influencing men's opinions we hope to reach into the atmosphere of their sentiments and dispositions and mould these accordingly. Our educational propaganda must therefore operate on the soil of the heart and use all influences in order to create a nobler spirit of patriotism among the nations, not chauvinistic, but broad and rational, and to inspire and intensify the devotion to those ends which embrace the common good of all peoples. With respect to the war-mania, if the pugnacious instinct proves too strong to be uprooted, and indeed too useful to warrant such uprootal, let us find other channels than warfare for its flow. Heroism may flourish on *other* fields than those of battle, and danger may confront the spirit on any plane of action, wherever endurance is required and self-sacrifices demanded; and let the heart of man be so influenced as to feel that the performance of the common tasks of duty exhibits as much heroism as any sensational feat of arms. The fight to secure control over the forces of Nature is of enough intensity and presents enough complexity to task the physical energies of man and his ingenuity to their limit and to serve as a convenient channel in which the strong current of man's aggressive instincts may flow.

In general, let us use measures to put these instincts into complete subjection to reason, in order that they may not run away with the individual agent, even when the bugle

calls of the jingoist and his press are loudest and the clash of the sword in the scabbard sounds most attractive to the ear. Not only should the exercise of the belligerent instincts be kept in restraint, but other instincts should be aroused and strengthened as well, namely, the sense of solidarity and the instinct of altruism as between nation and nation. Indifference is almost as bad as hatred, and the people of no nation should be indifferent to the needs of humanity at large and more particularly of their neighboring countries. To this end, the disposition to work in common should be sedulously cultivated and a national heart be bred which will suffer at the sufferings of the others as well as of its own, and the sentiment of sympathy be given an international as well as an inter-individual scope. Now, feelings and dispositions are fed primarily from the storehouse of example, and our propaganda of education will be effective in so far as it is enabled to point to conspicuous instances of states governed in their course by noble moral principles and when, indeed, there will exist such examples among the nations as will awaken and enhance the instincts of goodwill toward people and the bonds of sympathy among them.

What will be the field upon which our educators will cast their seed?

(a) Chiefly, perhaps, the hearts and minds of the *children*. Hopes for betterment center always on the coming generation, for the grown-ups have already cast themselves into a mould whose configuration they are unable to change to any appreciable extent, whereas the youngsters are pliable in nature and extremely susceptible to influence from without. The propaganda must begin in the school; *there* will the future leaders be trained to think internationally and to see not a potential enemy in a citizen of a foreign state, but a possible partner; there will the masses be instructed into a higher

patriotism, not indeed a patriotism which forgets the fatherland in order to remember humanity, but one which through attachment to the fatherland promotes service for humanity, which does not exclude interest in and desire for the good of the other nations and which finds place within an atmosphere of loyalty to the best and noblest interest of all mankind.

(b) Business is another field to be cultivated. The life of the peoples moves nowadays on the economic level principally, and much good may result if a proper direction be given to the forces which control the currents of economic life. By tightening the bonds of trade and commerce among the nations we increase the solidarity between them, and the first great step to let loose the energies of economic co-operation will be the establishment of *universal free trade*. Visits of tradespeople from one country to another should be encouraged and actively promoted in order that the people should know each other better, and it is a hopeful sign that labor has already transcended the borders of nationality and laborers of one country have co-operated and fraternized with laborers of another. This necessity of securing the members of humanity will make the acquaintance of each other, cannot be stressed too strongly, for, as the saying goes, to understand is to forgive, and by such mutual acquaintance many national prejudices will be killed. Furthermore, the means of communication between state and state become easier of access with time, but on the other hand the difference in languages necessarily persists; however, the genius of humanity, we may hope, will evolve an international language, a language of all mankind, not as replacing, but as supplementing the national languages.

(c) The church must take the position of a leader in the movement; the old view that religion concerns the fortunes

of the individual only, is passing away, and we believe that the salvation of society is just as imperative a task for religion as the salvation of the individual. And the church as the organization of the forces of religion must awaken to its mission of sounding the clarion call of justice and peace to nations as well as to individuals.

(d) And finally, effective work must be performed upon the soil of officialdom and diplomacy. Our politicians and diplomats have very often not kept in time with the beating of the people's heart and have made their own personal quarrels fruitful causes for international conflict. Political and diplomatic action should be given more and more, if possible, *complete* publicity, in order that such action be brought into closer touch with the life of the man in the street and the woman in the home. And the chief officers of the commonwealth must be recruited less from privileged classes and more from the mass, from the real workers and forgers of the nation's destinies, who naturally sense more directly the good of the country, who feel more intensely their solidarity with the other nations, so that the public administration and diplomacy of the future may be emancipated from the point of view heretofore adopted which would discover a foe in a stranger, and a prey in the neighboring nation, an object to be feared and plotted against or to be despised and exploited in the service of selfish ends.

We have said our say, and we may enjoy for a moment the pleasures of a retrospective glance.

Is the plan a Utopian ideal, is it all too good and impossible? Do we call for more than human nature can stand, for heights loftier than the energies of man can attain? No, we

do not think so. In the matter of disposition and feeling, we are urging that the consciousness of the nation realize what the consciousness of the *individual* has already made its own. Not a gushing sympathy, neither an unselfish self-sacrifice for the others, this is not strictly necessary, but essentially a sense of solidarity among the nations, such as has already been realized among individuals. The man, individually, knows that his interests are linked with the interests of his fellows, and, whether he loves his neighbor or not, he is ready to work with him or divide his labor with him. The savages used to fight against each other; now individuals co-operate with each other in order to fight, in the struggle of life, against Nature. Competition has not disappeared, but it has only altered in form, and now in villages, in towns and in cities you see men pursuing their daily labor at the side of their fellows, trading with them, forming partnerships together, and struggling in common to earn their living respectively, competing with each other, to be sure, and even cruelly, let us admit, but not by trying to destroy each other's potential energies and innate capacity to produce, but each by working to make a better success than his rivals, by making better goods and selling them at more reasonable prices, in effect, by outdistancing his fellows in the race for subsistence.

You will say that in all this the individual is working for his own interest, and indeed our point is precisely this, that the individual has recognized the truth that to promote his own good he must co-operate with his fellows in the promotion of their own. In other words, the scope of the personal interest has so enlarged that it now embraces the good of the other fellow as well, and the weaver upon Nature's loom perceives that to satisfy his own interest he must take account of the general interest of the community of which he

is a member. This is exactly what solidarity means. And why should it be impossible to develop precisely the same consciousness among the nations, so that competition among them will not be direct and in terms of violent conflict, but indirect, in terms of making the most of Nature, so that a given nation, pursuing with all its might the fulfillment of its destiny, will see and feel that its own good is bound up with the good of the other nations, and realize that, in order to have its own interest fulfilled, recognition must be awarded to the sum of all interests? Solidarity above all, and in every respect, this is to be the motto inscribed on the banner which will lead the people in the path of progress.

Change in national characteristics is slow and difficult, but change is not impossible. Once upon a time, and not very long ago, religious differences were causes of internecine wars and frightful devastations; now, matters of religion scarcely play a part in the regulation of the relations between states, and the Sheik-ul-Islam's fierce call to a "jihad" has fallen on avowedly scornful, even deaf, ears. We have recognized that progress will take its own time, that we may not hope to stop all wars at once, that our instruments are not perfect, and that, after all, we can aid only indirectly the steady work of Nature, just as the physician has similarly recognized with respect to the treatment of individual ills. To those who, losing their wits, and seized by hysterical fears, blunder as to the issues and set to getting rid of war in a mad hurry, acting as if war were a bubble to be blown into nothing with a mere whiff, we address the solemn warning of the ancient Greeks, "Σπεῦδε βραδέως" (make haste slowly) and beg to remind them that quick remedies are mostly *quack* remedies. And, if we are patient, we will have no reason to despair of witnessing better days. He who expects the achievement of the maximum, the ideally good and

perfect, will be surely disappointed, and bitter tears will shed the person who sets his heart upon catching the moon. But he who, shutting his eyes to schemes of Utopian perfection, aims only at the better, and from the better moves on to the still better, who is not discouraged by failures, but makes of obstacles stepping stones for further progress in a path of which he does not see the end, a *practical idealist*, in short, will surely not be disappointed.

THE END

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: MAY - 2002

Preservation Technologies

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 009 490 005 0